

H X 725

.L56

pt. 2

5c

Leninist League
"

THE

TROTSKY SCHOOL

OF

FALSIFICATION

• Part Two •

Published by

THE BULLETIN

P. O. Box 67

Station D

NEW YORK CITY

THE TROTSKY SCHOOL OF FALSIFICATION

N O T E

This publication continues the collection of articles appearing in T H E B U L L E T I N under the above title. Part One was issued in 1942 and consists of seventeen articles which should be read with the present collection. Part Two contains articles dealing with many fundamental aspects of Trotsky's opportunism which were not dealt with in Part One. The earlier aspects of Trotsky's role in the rise of Stalinism which are herein exposed are a necessary supplement to the current features of Trotsky opportunism combatted by T H E B U L L E T I N. The two together are required for a Marxist understanding of the political tendency chiefly responsible for preventing the rise of a new Marxist Party and International.

T A B L E O F C O N T E N T S

	<u>PAGE</u>
An Historical Fable	1
An Alibi and What It Conceals	8
Why Eastman and Not Trotsky	16
When Burocrats Quarrel	20
A Significant Phrase From Trotsky's Pen	25
Two Positions on the United States of Europe	28
Myths and Facts About Trotsky's Position on the Anglo-Russian Committee	32
Some Light on a Crooked Deal	39
"Germany Is Not Italy"	42
What Trotsky Taught About Hitlerism	45
"Breaking All Ties" With Stalinism	48
From The Arsenal of Stalinism	50
"We Never Promised"	52
The Fusion With the Musteites	54
Political Jugglery	59
Soviet Diplomacy:- Leninist versus Stalinist	63

ADDRESS COMMUNICATIONS TO:-

THE RED STAR PRESS
P.O. Box 67- Sta. D.,
New York

AN HISTORICAL FABLE

I N the initial phases of the Stalinist process of bureaucratic entrenchment and centralization in the Soviet Union, the national question necessarily assumed a key importance. The development of the Stalinist bureaucratic pyramid required the strangulation of the minor Soviet Republics and their conversion into bases of the centralized bureaucratic power of the renegade Stalin clique, the "trio" of Stalin, Zinoviev and Kamenev.

Because of its importance in the genesis of the Stalinist development, knowledge of the behavior of the leading figures influencing the events of this period is of crucial importance to the revolutionary workers.

In an article by John G. Wright entitled "Lenin on the Problem of Nationalities" published in the Fourth International of January 1943, the three-cornered relation of Stalin, Trotsky and Lenin, the three major figures of that period, is presented as Lenin-Trotsky versus Stalin. Wright states categorically that Trotsky's line on the national question merged with Lenin's during the first period of the Russian Revolution and the first four congresses of the Comintern and represented a direct continuation and extension of Lenin's line after the latter's death:

"Trotsky's work on the problem of nationalities parallels that of Lenin for 1903 to 1917. It merges with the latter in the first period of the Russian revolution and the first four Congresses of the Communist International. It represents a direct continuation and extension of it after Lenin's death." (p. 18)

Wright asserts further that Trotsky remained a consistent orthodox Leninist on the national question until his death:

"Trotsky remained to his death a

consistent orthodox Leninist on the national and colonial question." (Ibid.)

We reject as a falsehood any assertion or implication that in the period beginning with the rise of Stalinism Trotsky's line merged with Lenin's. To prove our contention we will examine — 1) Lenin's struggle against Stalin on the national question, and 2) Trotsky's line in this struggle.

LENIN VERSUS STALINON THE NATIONAL QUESTION

ACCORDING to all available material it was precisely on the national question that Lenin intended to give his first major battle to Stalin and his bureaucratic partners and assistants. In this sphere, Lenin observed the indissoluble connection existing between Stalin's policy on the national question and his drive to bureaucratize the party. We shall cite Trotsky's own testimony on this point:

"The bureaucratic degeneration of the state has rested like a millstone upon the national policy. It was upon this question that Lenin intended to give his first battle to the bureaucracy, and especially to Stalin, at the 12th Congress of the party in the spring of 1923." (L. Trotsky, "The Revolution Betrayed," p. 170)

In Soviet Georgia, Stalin, assisted by his henchmen Ordzhonikidze, Dzerzhinsky, Kamenev and others effected a typical bureaucratic coup d'etat by thug methods, installing a crew of his bribed flunkies to dominate the Georgian party and government.

Lenin was outraged by this maneuver and perceived in this Georgian scandal the falseness of Stalin's whole course on the national question. Trotsky was a close witness of these his-

toric developments.

"Vladimir Ilyich attached enormous importance to the 'Georgian' question not only because he feared the consequences of a false national policy in Georgia — a fear which had been wholly confirmed— but also because in that question was revealed to him the falseness of Stalin's whole course on the national question." (L. Trotsky, "The Stalin School of Falsification," p. 68)

Despite the fact that he was incapacitated by illness, Lenin immediately began a fight against Stalin on this question, making it the springboard of a fight against Stalin's whole role in the party. To the Georgians, Lenin dispatched a note stating that he was following their struggle against Stalin with all his heart. (Ibid., p. 69)

On his sick bed Lenin composed a letter on the national question condemning Stalin, and this document combined with other notes formed what Lenin termed a "bomb" against Stalin. Lenin intended to have this "bomb" hurled at Stalin at the 12th Congress of the Russian Communist Party to be held in April 1923. (L. Trotsky, "My Life," p. 482)

In general, according to Trotsky, the whole period of the last half year of Lenin's political life right up to the eve of the 12th Congress was filled with a sharpening struggle against Stalin:

"Thus it would be no exaggeration to say that the last half year of Lenin's political life, between his convalescence and his second illness, was filled with a sharpening struggle against Stalin." (L. Trotsky, "The Suppressed Testament of Lenin," p. 39)

Because of unmistakable signs of Stalin's dishonesty Lenin came to the position of rejecting any compromise with Stalin even on a correct line. Trotsky records this point which was established in his discussion with Fotiyeva, one of Lenin's secretaries.

Trotsky added:

"Then the thing has gone so far that Vladimir Ilyich no longer thinks that we can compromise with Stalin even on the right line?"

Fotiyeva replied:

"Yes, he does not trust Stalin, and wants to come out against him openly before the entire party." (L. Trotsky, "My Life," p. 484)

In excluding the possibility of compromise, Trotsky was told of Lenin's belief that "Stalin will make a rotten compromise and then deceive us." (Ibid.)

As a consequence, Lenin was preparing not only to remove Stalin from the post of general secretary but to disqualify him before the party as well. At the Twelfth Congress, Lenin intended to hurl a crushing blow at Stalin:

"Lenin was now preparing not only to remove Stalin from his post of general secretary, but to disqualify him before the party as well. On the question of monopoly of foreign trade, on the national question, on questions of the regime in the party, on the worker-peasant inspection, and of the commission of control, he was systematically preparing to deliver at the twelfth congress a crushing blow at Stalin as personifying bureaucracy, the mutual shielding among officials, arbitrary rule and general rudeness." (Ibid., p. 480-1. My emphasis -A.B.)

Let us reestablish the course of development at this juncture and keep it clearly before us. The last half year of Lenin's political life was filled with a sharpening struggle against Stalin. Stalin's introduction of thug methods in bringing the Georgian Soviet Republic under his sway formed the keynote for a struggle against him by Lenin. Stalin's manifestation of Great Russian nationalism and his concomitant drive to bureaucratize the party resulted in the crea-

tion of a "bomb" against him by Lenin with the intent of annihilating him politically at the 12th Congress of the RCP where the case of the persecuted Georgian leaders was to be brought into the foreground. Lenin's struggle against Stalin reached such a stage as to preclude any compromise whatever, not even one on a formally correct line.

TROTSKY'S AWARENESS OF LENIN'S STRUGGLE

THAT Trotsky knew of Lenin's struggle against Stalin is already apparent, since the evidence we have adduced has been selected from Trotsky's own writings. The crucial point to establish here, however, is whether Trotsky knew of Lenin's struggle in the period immediately preceding the 12th Congress and what Trotsky's line was.

All evidence unmistakably points to Trotsky's knowledge of this struggle. For one thing, Trotsky states that he was authorized by Lenin to fight Stalin at the 12th Congress. As a consequence, Glasser, another of Lenin's secretaries, was instructed to turn over to Trotsky all the manuscripts that were to make part of Lenin's "bomb" against Stalin:

"And he (Lenin) instructed me to hand over to you all the manuscripts that were to make part of his bomb for the twelfth congress." (Ibid., p. 484)

Further, continues Trotsky, Lenin's intentions with reference to Stalin were quite clear to him:

"Lenin's intentions now were quite clear to me: by taking the example of Stalin's policy he wanted to expose to the party and ruthlessly, the danger of the bureaucratic transformation of the dictatorship." (Ibid.)

Thus, there is no mistaking the fact that Trotsky was fully aware of Lenin's uncompromising intentions with reference to Stalin on the eve of the 12th Congress.

HOW TROTSKY REPRESENTED HIMSELF TO LENIN

FACTS indubitably indicate that Trotsky gave Lenin the impression that he would work shoulder to shoulder with him in the struggle against the Stalin clique. Trotsky, in his auto-biography quotes a conversation he held with Lenin prior to the latter's second stroke about three and a half weeks before the 12th Congress. Trotsky states that in this conversation he agreed to form a bloc with Lenin against bureaucracy in general and against Stalin's organizational bureau in particular:

"After thinking it over for a moment, Lenin put the question point-blank: 'You propose then to open fire not only against the state bureaucracy, but against the Organizational Bureau of the Central Committee as well?' I couldn't help laughing, this came so unexpectedly. 'That seems to be it.' The Organizational Bureau meant the very heart of Stalin's apparatus.

"'Oh, well,' Lenin went on, obviously pleased that we had called the thing by its right name, 'if that's the case, then I offer you a bloc against bureaucracy in general and against the Organizational Bureau in particular.'

"'With a good man, it is an honor to form a good bloc,' I replied." (Ibid., p. 479)

The impression, therefore, that Trotsky gave Lenin was unmistakably one of a bloc against Stalin.

TROTSKY'S ACTUAL LINE

THE basis for the struggle against Stalin and his bureaucratic aides was thereby laid by Lenin. A "bomb" on the national question was prepared by Lenin with the intention of crushing Stalin politically and disqualifying him before the party. Organizationally this line was to be implemented by the removal of Stalin and the placing of Trotsky as Lenin's deputy and successor to the post of chairman of the Soviet of People's Commissars:

4

"He [Lenin] planned to create a commission attached to the Central Committee for fighting bureaucracy. We were both to be members. This commission was essentially to be the lever for breaking up the Stalin faction as the backbone of the bureaucracy, and for creating such conditions in the party as would allow me to become Lenin's deputy, and, as he intended, his successor to the post of chairman of the Soviet of People's Commissaries." (Ibid., p. 479)

The 12th Congress was selected by Lenin as the battleground for the struggle against Stalin. As the eve of this Congress approached the struggle between Lenin and Stalin reached its sharpest form. At this time Lenin wrote his note to the persecuted Georgian leaders proclaiming his solidarity with them against Stalin. Almost immediately afterward Lenin wrote a note rupturing all relations with Stalin. At this juncture, Lenin's illness ripened into its most critical phase paralyzing him and completely eliminating him physically from this struggle. The burden of the struggle obviously then passed to Trotsky, to whom Lenin had turned over his political ammunition.

Trotsky reacted to the news of Lenin's paralysis by summoning Kamenev, one of Stalin's partners, for a discussion. Kamenev had seen Lenin's note to the Georgian leaders. As a consequence, says Trotsky, he was completely at sea, for Lenin's note cut into the plan which Zinoviev, Stalin and Kamenev had concocted to crown themselves legitimate successors to Lenin:

"Kamenev came an hour later. He was completely at sea. The idea of a trio — Stalin, Zinoviev, Kamenev — had long been established. The whole plan of the conspirators was that after they had mustered enough support in the organizations, they would be crowned legitimate successors to Lenin. The little note cut into their plan like a sharp wedge. Kamenev did not know what to do, and admitted it to me quite frank-

ly." (Ibid., p. 485. My emphasis—A. B.)

Trotsky relates that he then gave him Lenin's manuscript on the national question to read over. In addition, Kamenev had learned from Krupskaya of Lenin's note rupturing all personal relations with Stalin. Trotsky then describes Kamenev's reaction to this succession of events: "Kamenev was quite pale and agitated. The ground was slipping away under his feet. He did not know what to do next, or which way to turn."

And, indeed, the outlook appeared to be very dark for the Stalin clique. Trotsky, however, reassured this badly worried conspirator as follows:

"I gave him my opinion of the situation. 'Sometimes,' I said, 'out of fear of an imaginary danger, people are capable of bringing real danger down upon themselves. Remember, and tell others that the last thing I want is to start a fight at the congress for any changes in organization. I am for preserving the status quo.'" (Ibid., p. 485-6)

There can be not one iota of doubt that Trotsky's line as expressed here to Stalin's partner, Kamenev, was completely opposed to Lenin's line as it was laid down in the "bloc discussion" with Trotsky. The central feature of Lenin's line was precisely a fight against Stalin at the forthcoming party congress on the organization question. Trotsky himself wrote in connection with the "bloc discussion" with Lenin "the organizational bureau meant the very heart of Stalin's apparatus." No one who actually intended to carry out Lenin's line could say as Trotsky did "the last thing I want is to start a fight at the congress for any changes in organization."

To make it absolutely clear to the Stalin clique that he had no intentions of carrying out Lenin's uncompromising line of wiping out Stalin organizationally and politically, Trotsky made the following unequivocal and very reassuring statement to Kamenev:

"I am against removing Stalin, - and

expelling Ordzhonikidze, and displacing Dzerzhinsky from the Commissariat of transport." (Ibid., p. 486)

We see, therefore, two clearly defined political lines clashing with each other. One, for removing Stalin and breaking up his clique — Lenin's line; the other, against removing Stalin or disrupting his clique and against any fight for any changes in organization at the forthcoming party congress — Trotsky's line.

Having revealed the essence of his line, Trotsky curiously enough says he told Kamenev: "But I do agree with Lenin in substance." (Ibid.)

The discerning reader will readily see that Trotsky's statement to Kamenev voicing his opposition to the removal of Stalin was his real line and his story about agreeing with Lenin in substance was simply window-dressing, a self-protective cover. The discerning Kamenev understood Trotsky very well. Trotsky relates that at the end of their discussion — "Kamenev gave a sigh of relief." (Ibid.)

In order to understand the real meaning of Trotsky's actions in this period, it must be clear that the Central Committee of the RCP had already undergone a profound change in a reactionary direction. Indeed, from Trotsky's own testimony it can be learned that already in this early period of 1922-23, the Central Committee was a Stalin Central Committee:

"They became, Zinoviev and Kamenev with Stalin they created the so-called 'Troika,' or triumvirate, which was the directing body of the Central Committee of the Party and of the country during the period from the end of 1922 to 1925." (L. Trotsky, statement in "The Case of Leon Trotsky," p. 77. My emphasis—A. B.)

The line which Trotsky laid down to Kamenev was soon concretized in practice. Some days prior to the convening of the 12th Congress, the VII All Ukrainian party conference was

convened in Kharkov. To prepare for the 12th Congress, the Stalinist Central Committee dispatched a leading member of the Politburo to this conference. The manifest intent was obviously to hide the facts about Stalin's Central Committee and Lenin's opposition to its policies and to dupe the Ukrainian party conference into approving the treacherous policy and leadership of the Stalin clique. Who was selected for this dirty and fulsome task? None other than Leon Trotsky.

Trotsky's report was of such a nature as to get this conference to approve what was termed the "correct line" of Stalin's Central Committee and its "firm and capable leadership:"

"The business of the conference began with the hearing of Comrade Trotsky's report on the tasks of the xii Congress of the RCP... As a result of Comrade Trotsky's report a resolution was adopted in which the conference greets the correct line of the C.C. of the RCP and with satisfaction records the firm and capable leadership." (*Izvestia*, April 11, 1923. My emphasis, A. B.)

Thus, the "sigh of relief" which the conspirator Kamenev emitted after his conversation with Trotsky proved well-founded. Far from heralding the removal of Stalin and the forming of a Lenin-Trotsky bloc, the atmosphere of this conference was permeated with the idea of a Stalin-Trotsky bloc. Indeed, one Stalinist delegate, Petrovsky, coupled the names of Stalin and Trotsky:

"Let us hope that Ilyich will recover from his illness. Now the old guard must rally around his name and also around our experienced leaders, Comrade Trotsky, Stalin and others." (*Izvestia*, April 7, 1923)

A few days after the VII All-Ukrainian party conference, the 12th Congress of the RCP was convened. This was the battleground which Lenin had selected for the crushing of Stalin

6
politically and organizationally. All the leading characters were present but one. Lenin's absence was physical, not political, for his "bomb" on the national question was in the possession of Trotsky, his alleged partner in the bloc against Stalin. We have already given some portents of Trotsky's real line revealed in his conversation with Kamenev and in his behavior at the VII All-Ukrainian Party Conference.

At the 12th Congress of the RCP, the Stalin, Zinoviev, Kamenev Trio successfully carried out its policy against the Georgian party leaders and consolidated Stalin's grip on the party. Mdivani, one of the Georgian leaders present, complained bitterly against Stalin and demanded the publication of Lenin's letter on the national question. This cry for the publication of Lenin's letter was raised by another delegate, Yakovlev. Trotsky, present all the while, having the letter in his possession, uttered not a syllable. To extricate the conspirators from this unsavory predicament, Zinoviev took the floor and "explained" the reason for the suppression of Lenin's letter!

"Comrade Yakovlev demanded that the letter in question from Comrade Lenin should be published. The Presidium of the Congress of the Party adopted on this question a unanimous decision: not to publish for the time being this document in view of the character of those instructions given by Vladimir Il'yich himself. If the letter up to now has not been published, it is exclusively because of the indicated reasons." (Stenographic Report of the proceedings of the XII Congress. Russian Edition, p. 522. My emphasis - A. B.)

Zinoviev thus referred the delegates to a unanimous decision on this question by the Presidium buttressed by the excuse that Lenin himself did not want this letter to be published. This latter phase of the question was dealt with by Trotsky — not on the floor of the XII Congress — but many years later in a book. Here is what

Trotsky revealed concerning Zinoviev's alibi:

"The exhaustive and fundamental letter of Lenin on the national question is concealed from the party to this day. The pretense that Lenin did not intend this letter to be read to the party is false to the core." (L. Trotsky, "Stalin School of Falsification," p. 68. My emphasis - A. B.)

Plainly, then, when Zinoviev pretended that Lenin did not want his letter on the national question to be published, he was brazenly lying with the intention of shielding Stalin against whom Lenin's letter had been overwhelmingly directed. This letter, as Trotsky states, has never been published to this day, an indictment not only of the Stalin clique, but also of Trotsky who was a member of the Presidium which unanimously prevented the publishing of the letter against Stalin.

Obviously, no one but a person guided by ignorance or dishonesty can fail to label Trotsky's line for what it actually was — a stab in the back of Lenin.

The results of this Congress represented a victory for Stalinism and a betrayal of Bolshevism. Far from being the medium, as Lenin intended, for the crushing of Stalin politically and organizationally, the 12th Congress bolstered the Stalinist Central Committee by approving the political and organizational line:

"The Twelfth Congress fully approves the political and organizational line of the Central Committee which assures the party serious success also for the present year." (Izvestia, April 20, 1923)

This approval was unanimous!

"All our resolutions have been adopted unanimously." (Pravda, April 26, 1923)

Further, a unanimously adopted resolution went so far as to speak of an im-

provement of the organizational apparatus:

"The Congress remarks with satisfaction the improvement of the organizational apparatus of the Central Committee and the entire organizational work of the Party central in general." (Resolution on the Report of the Central Committee, Izvestia, April 23, 1923)

Thus we see that Trotsky's line expressed in his conversation with Kamenev, and at the VII All-Ukrainian Party Conference, and at the 12th Congress of the RCP followed a consistent pattern. A betrayal of Lenin's trust, a conscious deceiving of the revolutionary workers and collaboration with Stalinism. In the Stalinist development Trotsky played the repulsive Judas role, pretending to Lenin that he was in bloc with him and then betraying him.

TROTSKY'S "ORTHODOX" LENINISM"

JOHN G. Wright asserts that Trotsky remained an orthodox Leninist on the national question until his death. How orthodox Trotsky's Leninism was is demonstrated by his characterization years later of the pro-Stalinist 12th Congress as a Bolshevik Congress: "In reality the last Congress of the Bolshevik party took place at the beginning of 1923, the 12th party Congress. All subsequent congresses were bureaucratic parades." (The Soviet Union and the Fourth International, p. 24-25. My emphasis - A. B.)

Far from being an "orthodox Lenin-

ist" to his death, Trotsky continued to betray Leninism to his death and never faltered in the policy of concealing his betrayal of Lenin's line. Trotsky to his death pushed the lie that he had supported Lenin's line against Stalin:

"We have indicated above the signposts of the final struggle between Lenin and Stalin. At all stages Lenin sought my support and found it." (Suppressed Testament of Lenin, p. 32. My emphasis - A. B.)

This mendacious concealment of Trotsky's real role is an organic part of the general Trotskyist line. The purport of this line is to conceal Trotsky's renegacy from Bolshevism and collaboration with Stalinism. John G. Wright's falsifications in the sphere of this phase of history is a congenital and necessary aspect of the Trotskyite system.

Revolutionary workers desiring to combat and defeat the Stalinist reaction must be thoroughly clear as to the origins of the deadly Stalinist disease and the leading participants which made this deadly malady possible. Obviously, people like J. P. Cannon, John G. Wright and Max Shachtman, who all affirm in common that Trotsky pursued a struggle against Stalinism in the spirit of Bolshevism are distorters of the truth and can therefore only prevent workers from moving in the direction of a new revolutionary Bolshevik party.

A.B.

July 1943

Read

The Bulletin

SEND FOR FREE BACK ISSUES

AN ALIBI
AND WHAT IT CONCEALS

THE first systematic account of the Troika's (Stalin-Zinoviev-Kamenev) conspiracy to usurp power in the Soviet Union was published in 1925 by an American "Left" journalist, Max Eastman, under the title, "Since Lenin Died." Eastman presented a picture of the behind-the-scenes bureaucratic machinations of the wielders of power in Russia. There was one basic point, however, which Eastman did not present, namely, the real role of Trotsky in the conspiracy of the usurpers. Eastman either did not know it, or he deliberately concealed it. In any case he published his book in an effort to aid Trotsky against the Stalin clique which was maneuvering to oust Trotsky from power. The unexpected happened with a vengeance when Trotsky himself led the outpouring of abuse on Eastman for his book, "Since Lenin Died."

During the faction fight of 1940 between Cannon and Shachtman, Trotsky had occasion to reply to the accusation that he had deceitfully denied the authenticity of one of Lenin's last anti-Stalin documents which Eastman in 1925 published and quoted in his book. In the course of excusing his action, Trotsky harked back to that period of 1925 and the situation which he claimed gave rise to his disavowal of Eastman's revelations.

"Eastman published the document on his own initiative in a moment when our faction decided to interrupt all public activity in order to avoid a premature split. Don't forget it was before the famous Anglo-Russian Trade Union Committee and before the Chinese Revolution, even before the appearance of the Zinoviev opposition. We were obliged to maneuver in order to win time. On the contrary, the Troika wished to utilize Eastman's publication in order to provoke a kind of oppositional abortion. They presented an ultimatum: Either I must sign the declaration written by the Troika in my name or they will immediately open the fight on

the matter. The opposition center decided unanimously that this issue at this moment is absolutely unfavorable, that I must accept the ultimatum and sign my name under a declaration written by the Politburo." (L. Trotsky, "In Defense of Marxism," p. 160. Emphasis in original)

If a worker's knowledge of this affair is limited to this apologetic declaration, then Trotsky's excuse may seem quite plausible and may even be considered acceptable on the whole. An examination of what was actually occurring among the leading circles of the bureaucratized Russian Communist Party, however, will place the entire affair in a totally different light.

Trotsky speaks in the above-quoted passage of "the declaration written by the Troika" which he alleges he was forced to sign. This makes it appear that there was one such declaration by Trotsky denouncing Eastman. The fact is that there were two statements published under Trotsky's signature; one followed the other by a very brief period of time (Inprecorr, 1925). A very peculiar circumstance attaches to this fact. The first statement was published and an objection was raised to it by the bureaucrats of the French section of the Stalintern on the grounds that it was not emphatic enough against Eastman. If the first statement was written by the Troika, then this means that Stalin's own flunkies in France were objecting to a document emanating directly from the Stalin sanctum itself. From all that has ever been noted of the workings of the Stalinist bureaucracy, Stalin's flunkies were not in the habit of shooting their mouth off at Stalin and telling him how to run his affairs. The question is, therefore, was this first document really written by the Stalin clique — or was it written by Trotsky himself? In any case Trotsky issued a second statement, essentially of the same contents as the first, but stronger in tone. According to the

documentary evidence, then, the notorious Trotsky statement on Eastman — the second one, the more abusive one, which is traditionally referred to — appeared at the demand of the bureaucrats of the French section of the Stalintern. Trotsky never went into details of this tangled affair.

We shall now examine Trotsky's apology point by point.

(1)

"Eastman published the document on his own initiative in a moment when our faction decided to interrupt all public activity..."

The implied meaning of this remark is that prior to the appearance of Eastman's exposure Trotsky had been carrying on a struggle against the Stalin clique and then suddenly decided to cease fighting publicly presumably for the purpose of consolidating the anti-Stalin forces for further struggle. The question that must be raised is: What anti-Stalin public activity had Trotsky carried on which he decided to interrupt?

It is a fact substantiated by the testimony of historical records that Trotsky neither before nor after the Eastman exposure presented to the membership of the Russian Communist Party a single statement revealing that Stalin, Zinoviev and Kamenev had organized a factional Trio to usurp power and were pursuing counter-revolutionary policies in the Soviet Union and the Comintern. Let us present evidence from Trotsky's own pen showing the kind of "public activity" he pursued. A sample of such testimony is his letter of resignation from the post of War Commissar, dated January 15, 1925. This letter was published in Pravda before the whole Russian working class. Trotsky therein declared that during the hullabaloo just raised by the Stalin clique against "Trotskyism" — a sheerly factional invention to discredit Trotsky and weaken his power — he had remained silent and, he maintained, rightly so:

"And at the present time, estimating the whole course of the dis-

cussion and notwithstanding the fact that there have been advanced against me a multitude of false and actually monstrous accusations, I think that my silence has been right from the standpoint of the general interests of the party." (Pravda, January 20, 1925)

In this letter Trotsky looked back over the immediately preceding period which was the aftermath of the Thirteenth Party Congress (May 1924) and presented his line to the masses. It must be recalled that the monster of Stalinist bureaucratism had already profoundly penetrated into all phases of life in the Soviet Union and in Stalin's Comintern. The bureaucratic fakery of "socialism in one country" had already been introduced by Stalin and Company (Autumn of 1924). The apparatus of Stalinism was already enormous in the Party, the Government and the Soviets. But such was Trotsky's role, according to his own admission, that Stalin and all his allies and flunkies in the high bodies of the Party and Government knew perfectly well that Trotsky had advanced no policy whatever differing from that of the Stalinist center of bureaucratic power. To the uninformed reader who has in mind the usual picture of Trotsky as a veritable lion against the Stalinist Central Committee, Trotsky's description of his role will come as a distinct shock. Here are his own words:

"After the Thirteenth Congress there arose, or became more clearly defined, certain new problems of industrial, or Soviet, or international character. The solution of them has been a matter of exceptional difficulty. The idea was completely foreign to me to oppose any 'platform' whatever to the work of the Central Committee of the party in the solution of these problems. To all those comrades who were present at the meetings of the Politburo, the Central Committee, the Soviet of Labour and Defence, or the Revolutionary Military Soviet, this assertion needs no proof." (Ibid. Our emphasis)

At the very outset it becomes clear that Trotsky's alibi is distinct-

ly dubious, for one must ask skeptically: What "public activity" against the Stalin clique had he been conducting that he should offer the interruption of this alleged "public activity" as a justification for his slanderous attack on Eastman.

Let us look further into the real story of Trotsky in the rise of Stalinism to examine still earlier samples of his "public activity."

Stalin's public activity had long been a stench in the nostrils of many politically advanced workers. At the beginning of 1923 Lenin had proposed definitely to oust Stalin from the post of General Secretary and had outlined a fight to the finish against Stalin's bureaucratic assault on the various national minorities in the Soviet Union. In the Spring of 1923 the Stalinist Central Committee sent a member of the Politburo to address the 7th All-Ukrainian Party Conference upon the issues to be dealt with at the forthcoming Twelfth Congress of the Russian Communist Party. This member was Trotsky. As he himself showed after his exile from the Soviet Union, he had been thoroughly familiar with the counter-revolutionary nature of the Stalin Central Committee, and particularly so in connection with Stalin's reactionary organizational and national policies. He knew that Lenin was preparing an attack on the Stalin Central Committee's policies personified in its leader's treacherous role; indeed, Trotsky indicates that he had given Lenin the impression of forming with him a bloc to fight Stalin at the Twelfth Congress. In the light of these background factors, it is highly significant to see what the records of history tell about Trotsky's report to the Ukrainian Conference on the eve of the Twelfth Congress:

"As a result of Comrade Trotsky's report, a resolution was adopted, in which the Conference greets the correct line of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party and with satisfaction records the firm and capable leadership." (Izvestia, April 11, 1923. Our emphasis)

Trotsky had not told the Ukrainian

Bolshevik workers at the Conference a single word about the treacherous bureaucratic policies of the Stalin Central Committee, not a word about Lenin's proposed struggle against Stalin at the forthcoming Twelfth Congress. Trotsky had sold the workers a line of support to Stalin's Central Committee. Such was Trotsky's "public activity" in this earlier period.

At the Twelfth Congress of the bureaucratized Russian Communist Party held in April 1923 Trotsky was to present the documents Lenin had given him against Stalin and fight for the latter's removal. Lenin's documents were concerned with Stalin's disruptive policies on the national question and were to serve as a keynote in a campaign to disqualify Stalin completely before the whole Party and the whole working class. Lenin, due to severe illness, was unable to attend. But Trotsky was present in all his still enormous prestige and power before the masses. At the Congress Trotsky kept completely silent about the campaign Lenin had authorized him to launch against Stalin. News had circulated unofficially that Lenin had written a "bomb" against Stalin, and when some of the delegates inquired why this material was kept from the Congress, a most significant revelation was entered into the written record of the Congress. It reads as follows:

"The presidium of the Congress of the Party adopted on this question a unanimous decision; not to publish for the time being this document." (Stenographic report of the proceedings of the XII Congress, in Russian, p. 541. Our emphasis)

The most outstanding member of the presidium which unanimously voted to keep Lenin's anti-Stalin document out of the Congress was — Leon Trotsky. The remark about not publishing Lenin's document "for the time being" was, of course, a subterfuge. It was never published by the bureaucrats and though Trotsky had this momentous document in his possession for many years in his exile, he, too, never published this document on the national question. It was probably amongst that collection of Lenin's unpublished letters

which Trotsky sold to a bourgeois university with the strict stipulation not to publish them until 1980.

The latter part of the year 1923 was marked by the rise of a severe crisis in German capitalism. A revolutionary wave swept over the German toilers whose most advanced sections, unfortunately, were in the grip of the German agents of the Kremlin usurpers. The bureaucratic leadership foisted upon the German workers a treacherous line of support to the bourgeois-democratic parliamentary government of imperialist Germany. In Saxony and Thuringia where the revolutionary crisis was at its peak, the Stalinist agents, Brandler, Thalheimer and Boettcher, actually entered the bourgeois government, forming a coalition with the Social Democrats. What was Trotsky's "public activity" in this connection? In a speech to the Metal Workers Congress in Moscow Trotsky had the brazenness to compare the coalition of the Stalinists and Social Democrats formed on the basis of the bourgeois state to the proletarian dictatorship established in Russia after the overthrow of the bourgeoisie!

"At the present time the situation is clear. The coalition of the Communists with the Social Democrats in the government of Saxony and Thuringia is comparable to the coalition of the Communists and Left Social Revolutionaries in Russia." (Izvestia, October 21, 1923)

This was word for word the Stalinist ultra-rightist "Comintern" line on Germany, a line which paved the way for the bourgeois hangmen to let loose a bloodbath of the workers.

Trotsky's real public activity — support to Stalinist policies — was never interrupted. In 1924, after Lenin's death, Stalin packed the Russian Communist Party with hundreds of thousands of hand-picked stooges and backward elements upon which to rest his bureaucratic power. This maneuver the Stalin gang labelled the "Leninist Levy." In 1937, many years after the event, when the actual occurrences were completely dimmed in the memory of the workers, Trotsky wrote: "By

freeing the bureaucracy from the control of the proletarian vanguard, the 'Leninist Levy' dealt a deathblow to the Party of Lenin." ("The Revolution Betrayed," p. 98) This is absolutely true. But Trotsky in 1937 "forgot" to mention one little detail about his "public activity" in 1924 with respect to that Stalinist recruiting. At the Thirteenth Congress in 1924, speaking after Stalin had described the "Leninist Levy" in glowing terms, Trotsky echoed the treacherous bureaucrat's demagoguery in these words:

"Without a doubt the Leninist recruiting, as has been correctly stated here, [by Stalin] has brought our party closer to being an elective party." (Pravda, May 27, 1924. Our emphasis)

This is another sample of Trotsky's "public activity" which was directly fostering Stalinism.

What was the meaning of Trotsky's line? He had stood amongst the top leadership of the bureaucratized Soviet power. The Stalin clique had launched a campaign of bureaucratic centralization of power and had sounded as its keynote a drive to oust Trotsky, the most outstanding figure next to Lenin, from the commanding positions of the bureaucracy. The insidious transformation which had come over Trotsky since the past truly revolutionary years when he had fought the Czarists, the bourgeois-democrats, the White Guards and the Mensheviks and Social Revolutionary opportunists showed itself in the fact that on the question of the bureaucratic centralization of Soviet power, he adopted a policy of conciliation with the Stalin clique. To promote peace in the circle of bureaucratic leadership, Trotsky collaborated with Stalin-Zinoviev-Kamenev in every aspect of their counter-revolutionary political line. The slanderous attack on Eastman, an outstanding example of Trotsky's direct shielding of Stalin from exposure, was characterized by Trotsky himself in these revealing words:

"In any case, my then statement on Eastman can be understood only as an integral part of our then

line toward conciliation and peace-making." (The New International, November 1934, p. 125)

Peace-making and conciliation on the basis of a treacherous line in Stalin's interests! This line of support to Stalinism was the real source of Trotsky's 1925 statement on Eastman.

We have already shown that in his letter of resignation of January 15, 1925 Trotsky was still talking of his having no policy whatever opposed to the Stalinist Central Committee. This brings our narrative up to the period of his notorious attack on Eastman. What was Trotsky's "public activity" subsequent to the publication of "Since Lenin Died"?

(2)

"Don't forget it was before the famous Anglo-Russian Trade Union Committee..."

Presumably Trotsky meant that the Committee so flagrantly betrayed the workers that it opened their eyes to the treacherous nature of Stalinism and facilitated their rallying around the "Opposition." If so, let us see whether at the time of the existence of the Committee (the period of the General Strike in Great Britain, May 1926) Trotsky had a line of exposing the Committee and the opportunist Stalinist line with respect to it. The Anglo-Russian Committee was a Stalinist creation; at its head stood Tomsky, Stalin's loyal ally. The collaboration of the Stalinist bureaucrats with the reactionary British trade union leaders had as one of its purposes the betrayal of the prodigious strike sentiment that was then brewing in England. Trotsky, as well as his various cohorts, the Cannons and Shachtmans, in later years tried to give the impression that from its very inception Trotsky had fought the Anglo-Russian Committee and the whole Stalinist line surrounding it. But documentary records of that period turn up a speech by Trotsky to the Congress of Textile Workers in January 1926 in which he praised the Committee in enthusiastic language:

"The Anglo-Russian Committee of Unity of Trade Unions is the highest expression of that shift in the situation in all Europe, and especially in England, which is occurring before our eyes and which is leading toward the European revolution." (Pravda, January 31, 1926. Our emphasis)

This "highest expression" of the revolutionary development of that period of 1925-26 was soon to carry out the betrayal planned jointly by the Stalinist and trade union bureaucrats. The above was uttered by Trotsky before the sell-out of the General Strike was consummated. After the completion of the betrayal, Trotsky made another speech in which he pictured the Stalinized "Comintern" of 1925-26 as transferring to England the same principles and methods employed by the Bolsheviks in Russia in 1917. These remarks were made in the course of an exceptionally long-winded rignarole from which we cite only the relevant expressions to show the line Trotsky had on the Stalinist policy in the General Strike situation:

"Such was the voice of official British socialism in 1917 in the sharpest moment when the Bolshevik party was struggling against the imperialist war. And now, when the Comintern transfers the same principles and methods upon the soil of England.... when all these circumstances transfer the methods of Bolshevism upon the English soil...." (Pravda, June 2, 1926. Our emphasis)

Not only was there not one single syllable of exposure from Trotsky during the infamous double-dealing of the Stalinist in connection with the Anglo-Russian Committee, but Trotsky's "public activity" in this sphere consisted of direct aid to Stalin.

(3)

"Don't forget it was before...the Chinese Revolution, even before the appearance of the Zinoviev opposition."

Apparently with this remark, also, Trotsky tried to give the impression that his line on the Chinese Revolution and the Zinoviev opposition, with which he formed a bloc, were milestones in a real fight against Stalinism which Eastman with his 1925 book anticipated with indiscreet haste. Therefore it is necessary to show exactly what kind of "public activity" Trotsky engaged in during the bloc with Zinoviev and the Chinese Revolution.

These two events fall into the same period, the years 1925-27. The specific line which Trotsky had during the Chinese Revolution arose through a remarkable series of circumstances out of the bloc which he formed with Zinoviev and Kamenev. These two bureaucrats with Stalin had been partners in the scheme to centralize power in their hands. They had initiated the maneuver to oust Trotsky from power so as to seize the lion's share themselves. In 1925 Zinoviev and Kamenev realized that they had miscalculated, for it turned out that Stalin through his post of General Secretary had accumulated the bulk of bureaucratic power in his own clutches. Zinoviev and Kamenev were in danger of being left completely out in the cold. These two wily connivers cast about for clique allies to resist Stalin's pressure against them. Trotsky's opportunist policy of conciliation with the Stalinist bureaucratic center was first hand knowledge to Zinoviev and Kamenev. Further, Trotsky was in the same dilemma as Zinoviev and Kamenev for like them he had attempted to adapt himself to the bureaucratic process but had been caught short by the unforeseen placement of the real key to power in the hands of Stalin. Zinoviev, Kamenev and Trotsky were all ousted bureaucrats, double-crossed by the central figure, Stalin. With this natural merging of their several paths, Zinoviev, Kamenev and Trotsky formed a self-protective bloc in 1926, rallying many anti-Stalin workers to serve as a bargaining card with the onrushing Stalin spearhead of bureaucratic centralization of power.

Zinoviev and Kamenev, however,

were in a very embarrassing predicament at that point of the factional game. For some time previous, they had taken the lead in the scheme to destroy Trotsky's power in the bureaucracy. As a "polemical" cover — to make the swindle look like a fight for principles — they together with Stalin had dug up Lenin and Trotsky's old, long-dead differences on the theoretical question of Permanent Revolution. On this profoundly important question, Lenin had proved wrong and Trotsky right, and in 1917 they had liquidated their differences. Trotsky in later years related Lenin's admission that the former had been correct on the question of the Permanent Revolution. The admission had been made to Joffe, a very close friend of Trotsky:

"Joffe told me of his conversation with Lenin — it took place in 1919, if I am not mistaken — on the subject of permanent revolution. Lenin said to him: 'Yes, Trotsky proved to be right.'" (L. Trotsky, My Life, p. 535)

Hence, when Trotsky formed the bloc with Zinoviev and Kamenev, he had to render them a certain "diplomatic" service along lines which reveal the opportunist character of these people. Zinoviev and Kamenev, by their factional noise against Trotsky from 1923 to 1925 had turned their followers against him, and particularly on the question of the Permanent Revolution. The deceived followers of Zinoviev and Kamenev had taken the anti-Trotsky demagoguery seriously, and when a bloc with Trotsky was broached, the rank-and-file followers of Zinoviev and Kamenev were in an uproar of indignation. Many years later Trotsky gave a vivid description of the predicament of his new clique allies:

"Zinoviev's position at that time was truly tragic. Only yesterday a recognized leader of anti-Trotskyism, he on the next day bowed to the banner of the 1923 Opposition. At the sessions of the C.C., all the speakers took every occasion to fling in his face his own declarations of yesterday to which he could say nothing in reply. The

same thing was done day in and day out by Pravda. On the other hand, the advanced Petrograd workers, followers of Zinoviev, who had engaged honestly and seriously in the struggle against 'Trotskyism' could by no means reconcile themselves to the sudden turn of 180 degrees. Zinoviev was confronted with the danger of losing the best elements of his own faction." ("Archives of the Revolution," The New International, February 1938, p. 57)

Zinoviev and Kamenev were thus caught in a trap of their own making. Their contradiction was that of hundreds and thousands of the careerists who entered the service of Stalin only to be double-crossed and wiped out at the appropriate moment in the centralization process. This eminent pair of plotters tried to wheedle their way out of the mess. They got together with Trotsky in a scheme to set matters aright. A little maneuver had to be resorted to — little for hardened factional horse-traders, but of vast importance for the destiny of the work-ers. Zinoviev and Kamenev "merely" proposed that Trotsky publicly repudiate his theory of the Permanent Revolution. Trotsky agreed to conclude an alliance with these crooks. The repudiation concretely took the form of Trotsky's declaring that Lenin — who had actually been wrong — had been right! Trotsky made this lying statement publicly to the whole "Comintern." This repudiation of the Permanent Revolution was incorporated by Trotsky-Zinoviev-Kamenev in their Platform of the Opposition of 1927, the "theoretical" cover for their factional horse-deal, and reads as follows:

"Trotsky has stated to the International that in all those questions of principle upon which he disputed with Lenin, Lenin was right — and particularly upon the question of the permanent revolution and the peasantry." (Platform of the Opposition, printed in English under the title, "The Real Situation in Russia," p. 180. Our emphasis)

Was this maneuver anything more than a

crooked factional deal, an unqualifiedly unprincipled act? Listen to Trotsky's own description of the real source of his repudiation of the Permanent Revolution:

"With my acknowledgement of Lenin's correctness, Zinoviev sought, if only partially, to throw a veil over the previous criminal 'ideological' work of his own faction against me." (The New International, February 1938, p. 57)

A deal to satisfy the needs of a criminal, degenerated bureaucrat — here we have another sample of Trotsky's "public activity" — this time after his base attack upon Eastman.

In so far as Trotsky's line on the Chinese Revolution was concerned, it was based on a repudiation of the Permanent Revolution. It grew, as we have said, out of his renegade bloc with Zinoviev and Kamenev — and out of the whole logic of his policy of peacemaking and conciliation with Stalin in the division of the bureaucratic power in the Soviet Union. At a later time when Zinoviev and Kamenev in turn double-crossed Trotsky, the latter placed the guilt for the whole opportunist mess on Zinoviev. Referring to the Platform of the Opposition signed by Trotsky-Zinoviev-Kamenev, Trotsky wrote:

"In the Platform, the question of the Chinese revolution is dealt with very insufficiently, incompletely, and in part positively falsely by Zinoviev." ("The Third International After Lenin, L. Trotsky, p. 128)

Obviously, in "diplomatically" trying to place the onus for the opportunist line on the Chinese Revolution upon the shoulders of Zinoviev, Trotsky tried to conceal his own responsibility for this piece of deliberate criminality whose essence was the selling of the principle of the Permanent Revolution down the river for the sake of a self-protective clique alliance with a pair of utterly corrupted swindlers and renegades. Such was the kind of "diplomat" Trotsky had become in the

epoch of Stalinism — a far cry from Trotsky the Bolshevik diplomat of 1918.

Naturally, such a line of "public activity" on the part of Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev could never succeed in the effort to hang on somehow to their high positions in the bureaucracy. Stalin, faced by a sham opposition, rapidly advanced to supreme power. Fundamentally, he was aided in his rise to bureaucratic supremacy by the "opposition." The latter gave political support to Stalin's line, concealed the real essence of the usurpation of power that was occurring in the top leadership and opened the path for the complete crushing of the Soviet toilers under the bloody heel of Stalinism, and the delivery of the masses throughout the world, through the Stalinist counter-revolution, to the assaults of the bourgeoisie.

Trotsky in his alibi tried to convey the impression that he attacked Eastman because the latter foolishly jumped the gun, so to speak, i.e., he did not wait for the full development of the Trotskyist (alleged) fight against Stalinism. The essence of the fakery of this alibi is that Trotsky did not fight Stalinism, that his line was peacemaking and conciliation with the bureaucratic degeneration through supporting its reactionary policies. It was Stalin who did the fighting — to wipe out the other big figures and centralize all power in his own hands. He was entirely successful because the "opposition" was a fraud, a political branch of the Stalinist system itself, a prop to the basic bureaucratic degeneration masking itself under "opposition" colors. Out of this loyal "opposition" line grew Trotsky's treacherous 1925 attack on Eastman.

Send for a copy - free

The PART I
Trotsky School
of Falsification
A COMPILATION

How Trotsky "exposed" Stalin's Brezintern

The Political Nature of the Trotsky-Zinoviev Bloc

Trotsky and Kadek's Line on China

The Political Morals of the Trotskyite Leaders

WHY EASTMAN AND NOT TROTSKY?

In 1925 Max Eastman wrote a book, Since Lenin Died, which many years later The Militant recommended to its readers for an understanding of events in Russia and in the Comintern. The Militant, in 1930, referred to the book as the first to tell the inside story of what was happening in the Russian Communist Party.

The Militant's advertisement of Eastman's book reads:

"Since Lenin Died by Max Eastman
"The book that first told the inside story of the struggle between the Opposition and the beaurocracy in the Communist Party in Russia. The details of how the conspiracy was hatched against Leon Trotsky by Stalin, Zinoviev, Bucharin and others, was recounted originally in this excellent volume. It is invaluable for an understanding of present day events in Russian and world Communist movement."
(The Militant, May 3, 1930. My emphasis - D.S.)

The question this advertisement raises in the mind of the discerning political reader is: How did it happen that not Trotsky but Eastman was the first to come out with an account of a conspiracy hatched against Trotsky?

Upon reading Eastman's work the matter becomes even more baffling, because one learns that had he followed Trotsky's advice he would never have come out with what the Trotskyites call this first revelation of certain secret machinations in the Russian Communist Party. Eastman in his book uncovers the fact that Lenin left a letter or "Will" calling for the removal of Stalin as General Secretary.

But Trotsky, for some peculiar reason, did not want this "Will" to be publicized and, according to Eastman, instructed him to keep it secret! Eastman relates his conversation with Trotsky:

"Our first conversation was in regard my biographical portrait of his youth. It occurred, however, in the midst of the clamour about 'The New Course,' and I asked him one or two questions about that. All that I learned from him I have attributed to him in the text. Subsequently I met him for a moment accidentally: I told him then that I knew about 'The Testament of Lenin,' and he told me to regard whatever I knew as an 'absolute secret.' That has been an additional reason for my delay in writing this article." (Max Eastman, Since Lenin Died, footnote on p. 26. My emphasis - D.S.)

Only after some deliberation did Eastman finally decide to disregard Trotsky's strange instructions and to tell what he knew of the situation in the Russian Party. It should be noted that, to Eastman, Trotsky did not deny the existence of "The Testament of Lenin"; in actuality he corroborated Eastman's knowledge by asking for secrecy on the latter's part.

When Eastman, rejecting Trotsky's directive, published his knowledge of Lenin's Testament, Trotsky vehemently denied the existence of such a Testament and branded Eastman a liar!

"Comrade Lenin has not left any 'will'..... All talk with regard to a concealed or mutilated 'will' is nothing but a despicable lie....."
(L. Trotsky, Inprecorr, Sep. 3, 1925. p. 1005.)

As we have shown, the Trotskyites in 1930 recommended Eastman's book, calling it an excellent volume, "invaluable for an understanding of present day events in Russian and world Communist movement." But in 1925 Trotsky slandered the book, calling it a "botched work," and declared to the proletariat that Eastman was serving the interests of counter-revolution:

"There is no sincere worker who will believe in the picture painted by Eastman. It contains within itself its own refutation. Whatever Eastman's intentions may be, this piece of botched work is none the less objectively a tool of counter-revolution, and can solely serve the ends of the incarnate enemies of communism and of the revolution." (Ibid., p. 1006.)

Though Eastman's book revealed much of the corruption in the bureaucratized R.C.P. it was not a complete "inside story" of what was happening between Stalin and Trotsky. Eastman did not, for instance, explain why Trotsky asked him to keep secret a document which, if put into effect, would have struck a severe blow at Stalin and his corrupt system.

It is noteworthy that while the editors of The Militant on more than one occasion presented Eastman's book to the workers as one worthy of careful study, they diplomatically refrained from making any reference to these private instructions of Trotsky to Eastman to keep Lenin's Testament an "absolute secret."

Stalin suppressed everything that would tend to disclose to the masses the fact that Lenin's policy was to remove him and demolish him politically. Trotsky's confidential instructions to Eastman as well as his attack upon Eastman for revealing much truth about the bureaucratic intrigues in the Party were not isolated instances of Trotsky's collaboration with the Stalin clique in suppressing Lenin's anti-Stalin line.

Lenin's document in which the time for the removal of Stalin was set

in plain terms was written at the end of 1922 and early in 1923. According to Trotsky, it was read in secret before the leaders of the Party on May 22, 1924 (The Suppressed Testament of Lenin, p. 11), over a year before he came out in condemnation of Eastman. Facts show that this was not the only anti-Stalin document that Lenin wrote. At the end of 1922 Lenin, on his sick bed, wrote a letter in which he condemned Stalin for Great Russian nationalism. This document, together with other letters and notes, was called a "bomb" against Stalin, and was intended by Lenin for the Twelfth Congress of the Party, held in the Spring of 1923. All this was known to Trotsky at that time (My Life, p. 482). Trotsky not only knew of Lenin's line but he actually received the papers that comprised the "bomb." Trotsky relates that Glasser, Lenin's secretary, handed over to him these documents. Glasser told Trotsky—

"And he [Lenin] instructed me to hand over to you all the manuscripts that were to make part of his bomb for the twelfth congress." (My Life, p. 484.)

The question is, Why did Trotsky keep silent about Lenin's policy toward Stalin? At the height of power, Trotsky at that time was the most popular figure in the Soviet Union and in the Comintern, next to Lenin, whereas Stalin's existence was not even known to the wide masses. A correct answer to the question why Trotsky maintained silence about the Lenin-Stalin antagonism will give an idea why it was not Trotsky, a vital and central figure, but Eastman, a political dilettante and journalist, a more or less accidental factor in the situation, who was the first to come out with some revelations about the bureaucratic corruption of the leadership of the Russian Communist Party.

It is sufficient to investigate the political atmosphere of the Twelfth Congress and Trotsky's line at that gathering, which Lenin had designated as the arena for exploding his "bomb," to establish whether Trotsky stood with Lenin or with Stalin at

the very inception of the Stalinist degeneration of the Party. The Congress, as is known, was not attended by Lenin due to his physical collapse. The pages of Pravda and other Soviet papers were ablaze with reports about the unprecedented unity among the leaders — Stalin, Trotsky and others. Trotsky "forgot" about the "bomb" in his portfolio, and in his speech at the Twelfth Congress did not even hint at Lenin's line against Stalin. The Stalinist Trio — Zinoviev, Kamenev and Stalin — led the Congress politically and all their resolutions were adopted unanimously. Effervescing with enthusiasm and joy, Stalin declared:

"I must say, that it is a long time since I have seen such a Congress, unified, inspired by one idea... I regret that Com. Lenin is not here. If he were here, I think he would have said: 'For 25 years I nursed the party and finally nursed it to maturity.'" (J. Stalin, Pravda, April 20, 1923.)

Trotsky, who was a member of the Presidium of the Twelfth Congress — the first Stalinist Congress — gave full support to Stalin's political and organizational line of bureaucratism and corruption. He did it quite consciously, knowing all the time that the Leninist line was to open a fight against Stalin and his clique. Such was the treachery of all the bureaucratic leaders acting behind the back of Lenin who ".... was systematically preparing to deliver at the twelfth congress a crushing blow at Stalin..." (My Life, p. 480). At the Twelfth Congress Trotsky cemented his political ties with the Stalin clique.

Thus, Trotsky suppressed Lenin's "bomb" and later participated with Stalin in suppressing all other anti-Stalin documents of Lenin, including the Testament. His public denial of Lenin's Testament in 1925 had already been foreshadowed as early as April 1923. He had aligned himself with the Stalin clique and there he was to remain, unequivocally, until ousted by Stalin who maneuvered to seize all power for himself. Like others who

were to share such a fate (Zinoviev, Kamenev, Bukharin, etc.) Trotsky assumed the guise of an "oppositionist." The very fact that Trotsky and his Cannons and Shachtmans were compelled to make use of a book which only yesterday the leader of this "Left Opposition" had slandered as a book filled with lies, serving the interests of counter-revolution, is an excellent indication of the spurious nature of this "opposition." Unlike Trotsky, Eastman had no ties with the Stalinist clique and hence could tell what he knew. His only hesitation was due to Trotsky's request to keep secret what he knew. Trotsky withheld the truth, and denied the truth when it was published. To the workers he made grandiose speeches about the revolutionary character of the leadership of the Party, i.e., the Stalinist gang:-

"... it suffices to ask: 'If we assume that the malicious characterisation of our leading Party comrades given by Eastman is only partly correct, how is it possible that this Party should have emerged from long years of illegal struggle, how could it stand at the head of masses of millions carried through the greatest revolution of the world, and further the formation of revolutionary parties in other countries?'" (L. Trotsky, International Press Correspondence, Sept. 3, 1925, p. 1004.)

Many years later, outside the Soviet Union, Trotsky played the role of all loyal oppositions. He accused Stalin of withholding from the Party knowledge of Lenin's letter on the National Question, but concealed the fact that as a member of the Presidium of the 12th Congress he participated in this suppression. He accused Stalin of suppressing Lenin's Testament, but concealed his own participation in this suppression. Sixteen years after Lenin died Trotsky wrote an article hinting at the poisoning of Lenin by Stalin. But this story which he published in 1940 was known to him in 1923 and 1924, yet for sixteen years he remained silent, protecting Stalin. In 1924 when Trotsky's power and

view,
as-
ist."
d his
elled
only
t Op-
book
inter-
an ex-
ious
like
th the
d tell
on was
p sec-
held
h when
ers he
the re-
leader-
linist

authority were still enormous, such disclosures would have been a bomb-shell to blast Stalin off his pinnacle. In 1940 his article made hardly a ripple.

Thus a certain amount of investigation of Trotsky's role in the Stalinist degeneration of the Soviet Union, provides an adequate answer to the question "Why Eastman and not Trotsky?"

Eastman did not publish the full inside story of events in Russia, perhaps because he did not know them. Trotsky knew. But publication of the truth was not in Trotsky's interest. Like Stalin, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Radek, Bukharin and other degenerated leaders he had told too many lies, was guilty of too many suppressions and distortions, of participation in fostering

the cancer of bureaucratism which has brought the Soviet Union to the brink of annihilation. Although Cannon and Shachtman in 1930 gave the impression that they were anxious to have the "inside story" told, this was, indeed, furthest from their desire - and remains so. Exposure of Trotsky's role means automatic exposure of Cannon and Shachtman, albeit in addition they have a long opportunist record of their own to worry about. It is in their interest to continue to spread the illusion that Trotsky carried out Lenin's line and fought Stalin. This illusion amongst the workers is the political life-blood of Cannon-Shachtman & Co.

D. Simms

If we
aract-
y com-
only
ssible
merged
uggle,
head of
through
of the
tion of
other
Inter-
e, Sept.

NOW COLLECTED AND BOUND IN ONE VOLUME

Some articles which have appeared in this section in

THE BULLETIN -

TROTSKY AND SHACHTMAN VERSUS HISTORY

TROTSKY'S "ADVICE" TO THE RUSSIAN WORKERS

HISTORY WRITTEN TO ORDER

THE POLITICAL NATURE OF THE TROTSKY-ZINOVIEV BLOC

TROTSKY AND RADEK'S LINE ON CHINA

THE MOTIVES OF ZINOVIEV AND KAMENEV

THE POLITICAL MORALS OF THE TROTSKYITE LEADERS

AND MANY MORE ARTICLES

THE TROTSKY SCHOOL

OF
FALSIFICATION - PART
I

Send For Free Copy

the So-
role of
accused
e Party
on the
ed the
esidium
cipated
d Stal-
tament,
tion in
s after
article
enin by
he pub-
him in
years
Stalin.
r and

WHEN BUROCRATS QUARREL

THE internal faction fights in the American Trotsky movement have brought to light considerable interesting material bearing on the political character of the leaders of the several factions. One such document is a series of articles by J. P. Cannon, "The Struggle for a Proletarian Party," in which Cannon defends himself against the attacks of the Shachtman group in the 1940 period.

Amongst the outstanding charges of the Shachtmanites against Cannon was that his organizational methods in the Socialist Workers Party were marked by Stalinist bureaucratism. In defending himself against this charge, Cannon with great approval quoted a declaration by Shachtman made in 1935 when the latter was still in close alliance with Cannon. Shachtman at that time, during an internal factional struggle, tried to prove that there was no element of Stalinism in the organization led by Cannon. To do this Shachtman shifted the question from the concrete organizational situation in the American Trotsky group to some very general factors of class relationships. The passage which Cannon in 1940 quoted so approvingly gave what was purported to be an historical argument. For illustration Shachtman argued that the tendency which Lenin attacked in Stalin was not purely his organizational tendency, but rather Stalin's reactionary reflection of certain class relations in Soviet Russia. From Lenin's statement in the Testament that the rule of the proletariat is based on the collaboration of two classes (workers and peasants), Shachtman somehow drew the conclusion that "This creates the whole environ-

ment for the growth of a Soviet Bureaucracy." Such a class basis for Stalinist bureaucratism, argued Shachtman, did not exist in the American Trotsky movement, and moreover in light of the fact that vast material power such as Stalinism has was also lacking, it was infantile to speak of Stalinist bureaucratism in the American Trotsky group (in 1935 called the Workers Party). Although the passage from Shachtman which Cannon quotes is very lengthy, we must reproduce it in full, with Cannon's introductory remarks:-

"In an article entitled, 'The Question of "Organization Methods," signed by Shachtman under the date of July 30, 1935, and published in the Workers Party Internal Bulletin, No. 1, he answers the argument about "Stalinism" as follows:

"But then (it is now argued by some), didn't Lenin launch a struggle against Stalin purely because of the latter's organizational methods, his rudeness and disloyalty, and propose on those grounds to remove him from his post? To this reference is added the broad insinuation that we here constitute a similar bureaucracy, with similar methods, who must be fought as mercilessly as Lenin and Trotsky fought Stalin.

"The analogy does not even limp because it hasn't a leg to stand on. It is of the most superficial nature and betrays a failure to understand the problem of the Stalinist bureaucracy and Lenin's attitude towards its central figure. (1) It is not true that Lenin op-

posed Stalin solely on organizational grounds. The famous testament is prefaced by the significant observation that the rule of the proletariat is based upon a collaboration of two classes. This creates the whole environment for the growth of a Soviet Bureaucracy. This bureaucracy, in the period of its degeneration, in the midst of a constantly self-reproducing capitalism, represents the pressure of alien classes. Because of this fact, the bureaucracy tends more and more to bear down upon the proletarian kernel of the country; it shows an increasing contempt for it and a growing inclination to lean upon enemy classes. Stalin was the personification of this bureaucratic tendency. If the testament is read in connection with the noted articles and letters Lenin wrote shortly before his death, the political and class connection will become apparent. If nothing is learned from the testament except that "Stalin is rude - remove him!" - then, indeed, nothing has been learned. (2) The bureaucracy in the Soviet Union is a social phenomenon. It has deep roots in Russia's past and present historical development. It has close class connections. It has tremendous material and intellectual power at its disposal - power to corrupt, to degenerate, to undermine the proletarian base of the Union. To speak of our pitiful little "bureaucracy" in the Workers' Party - or any section of it - in the same breath with the Stalinist bureaucracy, can be excused only on the grounds of political infantilism." (J. P. Cannon, Internal Bulletin, S.W.P. April 1940, p. 19. My emphasis J.C.H.)

Cannon recommends careful study of this argument of Shachtman's:-

"That quotation deserves study by the comrades in the party who want to probe to the bottom of this light-minded talk about 'Stalinism' in connection with the regime in our party. The whole paragraph deserves study line by line and word by word." (Ibid.)

Shachtman's effort in 1935 to shift the argument from the factor of specific organizational situation to some general factor of class relations is a very typical performance. This maneuver is worthy of some study, for the real nature of Stalinist bureaucratism, its origin, growth, purpose and outcome are involved, as well as the political methods of Shachtman and Cannon.

Shachtman tried to give the impression that in the Testament Lenin did not attack Stalin for purely organizational reasons. Shachtman makes it appear that in the Testament Lenin based his approach to Stalin on the grounds of some general class relations, that Lenin considered the growth of bureaucratism, as personified by Stalin, to be fostered by these general class relations. It is with this purpose that Shachtman states:- "The famous testament is prefaced by the significant observation that the rule of the proletariat is based upon a collaboration of two classes. This creates the whole environment for the growth of a Soviet Bureaucracy." This was Shachtman's fundamental premise in shifting the problem from the specific organization question to general class relations.

Shachtman's linking — with Cannon's approval — of the growth of the bureaucracy which Stalin personified with the rule of the proletariat resting on the collaboration of two classes (workers and peasants) sounds very "Marxist," especially to those who do not know Lenin's actual position. An investigation of what Lenin actually said in the Testament will reveal that Lenin's position was the exact opposite of the picture Shachtman painted and Cannon quoted later to support himself.

Lenin observed the growth of Stalinism at its initial stages and tried to prepare a struggle against it. By 1923, when the Testament was completed, Stalinist bureaucratism was already highly developed. As a result of the bureaucratic machinations afoot behind the scenes, a split was threatening in the Central Committee and in

the Party, so it seemed to Lenin. Did Lenin link this situation with the factor of the collaboration of the two classes? An affirmative answer is what would follow from the Shachtman-Cannon argument. The concrete, specific statement of Lenin's Testament, on the other hand, constitutes unequivocally an answer in the negative. Lenin unceremoniously pushed aside what Shachtman-Cannon pretended were the primary factors in Lenin's estimation. Here are Lenin's words quoted from the Testament as published many years ago by the Trotskyites themselves:

"Our party rests upon two classes, and for that reason its instability is possible, and if there cannot exist an agreement between such classes its fall is inevitable. In such an event it would be useless to take any measures or in general to discuss the stability of our Central Committee. In such an event no measures would prove capable of preventing a split. BUT I TRUST THAT IS TOO REMOTE A FUTURE, AND TOO IMPROBABLE AN EVENT, TO TALK ABOUT." (The Suppressed Testament of Lenin, Pioneer Publishers, 1935, p. 5. My capitals-J.C.H.)

Clearly, the split due to bureaucratism which Lenin thought threatened in the Central Committee and the Party had nothing to do with the collaboration of the two classes. A split on the basis of class disagreement, Lenin held, was "too remote a future, and too improbable an event, to talk about."

Since, contrary to the pretenses of Shachtman-Cannon, it was not a matter of class factors, what, then, did Lenin have in mind when he dealt in the Testament with the situation in the Central Committee and the Party? The next paragraph of the Testament answers this in unmistakable words. Lenin had in mind considerations "of a purely personal character" as "influencing the near future:-

"I have in mind stability as a guarantee against a split in the near future, and I intend to examine here a series of consider-

ations of a purely personal character." (Ibid., My emphasis-J.C.H.)

In the next paragraph Lenin stated that the fundamental factor was the relations between two specific persons, and proposed as a remedy a purely organizational alteration:-

"I think that the fundamental factor in the matter of stability - from this point of view - is such members of the Central Committee as Stalin and Trotsky. The relation between them constitutes, in my opinion, a big half of the danger of that split, which might be avoided, and the avoidance of which might be promoted in my opinion by raising the number of members of the Central Committee to fifty or one hundred." (Ibid. My emphasis - J. C. H.)

The character of the remedy proposed by Lenin is in itself, even disregarding his direct denial of a class basis for the split he believed impending, a proof that Lenin did not have in mind some general class factors, but was motivated exclusively by certain specific organizational factors. Notice Lenin's proposed remedy - to raise the number of members of the Central Committee to fifty or one hundred. This was tied up with the relations of two Central Committee members, Stalin and Trotsky, with personal relations, Lenin explicitly indicated. If the situation in the Central Committee were based on class factors, such a remedy would have been fantastic and infantile, since numbers make no difference where fundamental political lines are involved. Obviously, Lenin had in mind to dilute the power of the members of the Central Committee, or at least of certain members.

The next sentence of the Testament reveals more in detail precisely what was in Lenin's mind. Stalin has too much power; he does not wield it well:

"Comrade Stalin, having become General Secretary, has concentrated an enormous power in his hands; and I am not sure that he always knows how to use that power with sufficient caution." (Ibid.)

35

In relation to the actual situation, these words, of course, were very mild, but they show what Lenin viewed as the crux of the situation.

The following portions of the Testament continue with personal evaluations of various members of the Central Committee. Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Bukharin and Piatakov are weighed in the balance.

The postscript of the Testament attacks Stalin for rudeness, impatience, lack of loyalty, impoliteness, inconsiderateness and capriciousness. Again, Lenin proposed a purely organizational change, the removal of Stalin from the post of General Secretary as a means of preventing the split Lenin thought was in the offing.

It is clear that Lenin purposely stated that a split based on disturbed class relations was too remote even to talk about so as not to leave any doubt that he had in mind precisely personal and organizational matters, not general class relations. It is a remarkable fact that in the Testament, which was intended as a blow against Stalinist bureaucratism, the entire subject matter consists of a discussion of individuals. The reason is that this is how the problem of the growth of Stalinist bureaucratism appeared to Lenin.

The Testament shows unmistakably that the essence of the question of Stalinism was the question of power, the power which had become concentrated in the hands of the bureaucrats. Stalinism arose as, and consisted of, a criminal usurpation of power by certain corrupted individuals in the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party. These individuals represented themselves, i.e., their own bureaucratic, careerist interests. A number of years before, as revolutionaries, they had helped to establish a Workers State. But they degenerated, and from revolutionaries they were transformed into careerists devoted not to revolution and socialism but solely to their personal power, privilege, position, and prestige. These renegades did not act as the agents of either the proletariat or the peasant-

ry. The careerists feared the workers and peasants who were foes of bureaucratism. They feared Lenin who was preparing a battle against the whole conniving clique. And they also feared the bourgeoisie who were striving to destroy the Soviet republic which was the material basis of the bureaucrats' careerism. The usurpers in need of a political machine, deliberately built their bureaucracy through the method of bribery, job distribution and wire-pulling, to fortify their power and position against the toilers. Dreading the advance and spread of the proletarian revolution - (we speak of the period of 1922-1923) - which they knew to be a threat to bureaucratism, they deliberately introduced reactionary policies for the express purpose of strengthening their own usurped power against the toilers. In 1923 they purposely betrayed the German revolution to safeguard their usurped power. Such treacherous policies, historically, operated in the interests of the bourgeoisie, but this was an indirect result, for the careerists' primary concern was their own power, not the needs of this or that class.

It was no accident that Lenin expressly declared against vague prattle about general class relations in discussing the rising Stalinist danger. The crux of the problem was the bureaucratic degeneration of certain individuals in the Central Committee. Stalin had shown his hand far more than anyone else, and was therefore singled out as the most immediate menace.

Class relations are, of course, of basic importance for an understanding of historical, economic and political developments. Events occur in the context of class relations. Thus, the Stalinist usurpers, while representing their own, individual, careerist interests, functioned historically in the interests of the imperialists. It is only in this way that the factor of general class relations enters into the problem of the rise of Stalinism. But to talk, like Shachtman-Cannon, in general terms about class relations in connection with the origin and rise of Stalinism is to conceal the specific individual corruption and degeneration

of the various Bolshevik leaders which was the real origin of Stalinism:

Shachtman in 1935, for his own careerist interests, wanted to conceal the concrete bureaucratism of the specific individuals of the Cannon machine, of which Shachtman was at that time a part. Hence in giving an "historical example," the case of Stalin, Shachtman introduced his general talk about class relations and pushed out of view the factor of personal and organizational degeneration. This is a political trick common to bureaucrats who are striving to hide their bureaucratism — to talk it out of existence with vague chatter about "class relations." This distracts the attention of the workers from the actual problem, the specific bureaucratism of the opportunist organizations, and shunts them off to "theoretical" discussions. Meanwhile the swindlers at the top continue their bureaucratic practices.

When Shachtman in 1940 raised the cry against Cannon of Stalinist bureaucratism, he was telling some truth on this score at least. This was a case

of "the Devil quoting Scripture." Shachtman, naturally, concealed the fact that he himself, for years the ally of Cannon, was a prime builder of the bureaucratic Cannon machine. Shachtman's fraudulent argument about Lenin's Testament and "class relations" is only one example of the demagogic trickery used by Shachtman to protect the Cannon outfit while he was a part of it. Only Shachtman's factional, careerist effort to create a group of his own led him to start a rumpus about Cannon's Stalinist tendency and to concoct "political differences" with Cannon.

Cannon in 1940 had the same purpose as Shachtman in 1935. Anxious to conceal the specific character of his leadership — its bureaucratism, its careerism — Cannon quoted Shachtman's convenient "theoretical" fabrications.

This is inevitably the outcome of the faction fights of bureaucrats who pose as Leninist revolutionaries. Falsification, distortion and deception are their methods. Self-exposure is the penalty they have to pay.

J. C. Hunter

FREE Copies

THE POLITICAL MORALS
OF THE
TROTSKYITE LEADERS

Unmasking the pretensions of the Cannons and Shachtmans and of their "inspirer," Trotsky, whose fraudulent efforts to appear infallible are only one symptom of their essentially Stalinist character.

Address:
P.O. Box
Station
New York

A SIGNIFICANT PHRASE FROM TROTSKY'S PEN

In 1932, against the sombre background of a decade of Stalinist ravages, Trotsky penned a pamphlet "The Suppressed Testament of Lenin." The work contains many pieces of valuable information. In connection with our investigation of Trotsky's role in the Stalinist development we have often quoted passages from the pamphlet. In it there occurs a phrase which never arrested our eye, never held any special meaning to us until after we had read an article by Trotsky published in Liberty in August 1940. Historically this 1940 article represents one of the most startling revelations of the crimes of Stalinism. Coming as it did eight years after Trotsky's pamphlet which dealt with Lenin's Testament, his article in Liberty shed a ghastly light on the phrase under discussion.

The contents of the article "Did Stalin Poison Lenin?" point unmistakably to a positive answer to the question raised in the title. In the text Trotsky quite openly tells the story of how in 1923 ^{Stalin} secretly proposed that poison be sent to Lenin alleging that Lenin had asked him for it to end his suffering. Trotsky clearly intimates that Stalin's allegations about Lenin's "request" for poison were fraudulent, and that Lenin's death in 1924 came not as the result of a stroke, as the whole world was led to believe, but as the result of poisoning by the treacherous conspirator, Stalin. According to Trotsky, Stalin himself took charge of the autopsy. Trotsky subtly adds that the physicians did not search for poison - a strange statement to make, especially in view of his remark "They understood that politics stood above medicine." Striking, too, are Trotsky's words about Stalin's flunkey Yagoda, a pharmacist by profession who according to Trotsky possessed a cabinet of poisons! The attitude of Zin-

oviev and Kamenev, Stalin's partners in the Triumvirate they established during Lenin's illness, was no less remarkable: "They avoided all discussion of Lenin's death." Bucharin however, according to Trotsky made "strange allusions" as follows: "'Oh, you don't know Koba (Stalin),' he said with his frightened smile. 'Koba is capable of anything.'"

Used by Stalin as a scapegoat for seventeen years, Trotsky published the article "Did Stalin Poison Lenin?" after an attempt on his life by a gang of Stalinists in his Mexican home in 1940. Very likely the cup of his patience with Stalin had overflowed. This article brought to us with redoubled force the understanding of the depth and blackness of the Stalinist degeneration and of Trotsky's part in it. And then, in rereading Trotsky's pamphlet, "The Suppressed Testament of Lenin" written eight years earlier, we were startled by the phrase which prior to the appearance of the article "Did Stalin Poison Lenin?" had only a figurative meaning to us. Contrasting Sverdlov with Stalin as two types of organizers, Trotsky wrote that significant phrase which we are putting in capital letters for emphasis:

"When at the tenth congress, two years after the death of Sverdlov, Zinoviev and others, not without a hidden thought of the struggle against me, supported the candidacy of Stalin for General Secretary - that is, placed him de jure in the position which Sverdlov had occupied de facto - Lenin spoke in a small circle against this plan, expressing his fear that 'this cook will prepare only bitter dishes.' That phrase alone, taken in connection with the character of Sverdlov, shows us the difference between the two types of organizers: the one

THE TROTSKY SCHOOL

tireless in smoothing over conflicts, easing the work of the collegium, and the other a specialist in bitter dishes - NOT EVEN AFRAID TO SPICE THEM WITH ACTUAL POISON." (The Suppressed Testament of Lenin, p. 22)

Thus, in 1932 Trotsky wrote that Stalin was not afraid to put actual poison into bitter dishes! Into whose food Stalin put poison Trotsky did not even distantly indicate then. The connection of this significant phrase with the article "Did Stalin Poison Lenin?" is obvious. The phrase was a clear dig at Stalin and was understood only by him and those who knew the actual details of Lenin's death as later described by Trotsky in his Liberty article. To the workers Trotsky's intent in writing this strange phrase could not possibly be apparent. They could hardly take it literally, least of all in connection with Lenin's death. Nowhere in the entire mass of information of all shades was there ever the remotest hint implicating Stalin or anyone else in Lenin's death. Then, sixteen years after Lenin's death and eight years after the appearance of that queer phrase, came the open hint from Trotsky. The principal witness of the Stalinist degeneration, Trotsky stood in the very thick of the situation surrounding Stalin's rise to power. When Trotsky in 1940 published the shocking article "Did Stalin Poison Lenin?" he was virtually the sole survivor of the limited number of people who were intimate associates of both Lenin and the Trio (Stalin-Zinoviev-Kamenev). If there was a man in 1940 who knew better than anyone else, outside, of course, of Stalin himself, whether Stalin actually poisoned Lenin, it was Trotsky. When Trotsky asked a question in the title of the article in Liberty he was fully aware that he alone in the entire capitalist world could supply the precise answer. Using cautious words he does supply the answer.

Trotsky was a powerful figure in the Soviet Union. He was extremely popular with the workers at home and abroad even after Lenin's death and for some years during the steady rise

II PARTICIPATION

of Stalin to personal domination and tyranny. Had he during his popularity made public the details of the "poison consultation" as well as the mysterious circumstances in which Lenin suddenly died, the whole world would have been ablaze with excitement. The revolutionary proletariat of the Soviet Union would have been aroused. The arrest of Stalin, Yagoda and others and the investigation of the true cause of Lenin's unexpected death would have been the logical result. There can be no doubt Trotsky clearly understood this and for some "mysterious" reason saved Stalin's neck by keeping silent. What caused him to maintain silence for sixteen years and come out with the shocking hints and innuendos only when he had been completely shorn of all power and of his former popularity and therefore could cause no sensation with such revelations has been clear to us through our examination of his role in the bureaucratic degeneration of the Soviet Union.

In connection with Trotsky's article "Did Stalin Poison Lenin?" one would think that Cannon and Shachtman, both setting up the claim of being the authentic anti-Stalinists in the workers camp, would have seized upon the statements of their own chief to use them as a weapon against Stalin. The least one could expect from them would be some sort of comment on that article. But, no, the Trotskyite leaders have maintained an unbroken silence throughout the two and a half years since the publication of that article.

In this instance, as in numerous others, the policy of hushing up is the only way out for them. Indeed, without destroying the halo of idealization with which they invested Trotsky's name they cannot very well dispose of the matter by declaring that Trotsky's article is a pack of lies. On the other hand, should they acknowledge Trotsky's open hint of assassination of Lenin by the Usurper, the most embarrassing question arises. They would have to explain why Trotsky kept mum for so many years, why he did not expose Stalin immediately after the plotter breached the proposition of sending poison to Lenin. The true answer

to these questions can never be given by the Trotskyite leaders for to do so would disclose Trotsky's real role in the bureaucratic intrigues for power conducted by the Politburo during the period of Lenin's illness. The sole answer to these questions is, of course, that Trotsky was vitally interested in avoiding a scandal during the formative stage of Stalinization because he himself was very deeply involved in the bureaucratic intrigues for power in the Soviet State. His silence about the "poison consultation," about Lenin's "bomb" which Lenin entrusted to him to explode against Stalin at the Twelfth Congress of the Party (April 1923), Trotsky's suppression of this "bomb" and his siding with Stalin at that Congress, as the proceedings of the Congress clearly show, Trotsky's participation in the suppression of Lenin's anti-Stalin documents, including the famous Testament, Trotsky's political support to Stalin before and even after the Stalinist destruction of the best section of the Russian proletariat which gathered around the "Opposition," his support to Stalin before and even after the "Moscow Trials" -- all his pro-Stalinist activity of two decades masked with very noisy but quite harmless (to Stalin) "criticism," was due to his collusion with Stalin at the initial stage of the bureaucratic conspiracy for entrench-

ment in power.

* * *

AFTER all the major features of the bureaucratic degeneration of the October Revolution, with its dark plots and intrigues for personal power, with its assassinations and appalling crimes against the masses are unearthed, the story will read like a frightful nightmare. Among the names of the protagonists of this awful drama, next to the names of Stalin, Yagoda, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Bucharin, Rykov and all the other renegades and criminals, will stand the name of Trotsky. The Cannons and Shachtmans will continue, of course, their policy of hushing up the damning facts about Trotsky and bamboozling their honest followers with Trotsky's and their own fabrications. But the work of digging up the true facts of the gory history of the debasement of the October Revolution will go on. Simultaneously will go on the unmasking of the Cannons and Shachtmans who are just an opportunist by-product of that debasement.

G.M.

NOW COLLECTED AND BOUND IN ONE VOLUME

THE TROTSKY SCHOOL OF FALSIFICATION - PART I

A Collection of Seventeen Articles Published in Past Issues of THE BULLETIN
in the Section

THE TROTSKY SCHOOL OF FALSIFICATION - PART I

SEND FOR A FREE COPY

Address:
P.O. Box 67
Station D
New York

TWO POSITIONS ON "THE UNITED STATES OF EUROPE"

FROM time to time, the Trotskyite magazine, Fourth International, reprints articles by Trotsky in its archive section, "From the Arsenal of Marxism." Some of these articles of Trotsky's are indeed from that arsenal, for it cannot be denied that at one time in his life, very long ago, Trotsky stood on a fundamentally Marxist line. Other articles by Trotsky, however, are from a totally different arsenal, coming from the period of the Stalinist bureaucratic degeneration of the leaders of the October Revolution.

It is enlightening to compare articles written on the same topic in these two opposite periods. Two recent issues of the Cannonite magazine reprinted articles by Trotsky dealing with the question of the United States of Europe. One article, (Fourth International, May 1942, p. 156), is from the 1915-1917 period in which Trotsky, growing greater in revolutionary calibre, was rapidly moving towards the Leninist trend; the other (Ibid. July 1942, p. 220), was written in the early Summer of 1923, in that latter phase of Trotsky's political career, during the rule of the Trio (Zinoviev-Kamenev-Stalin).

The first article, from the period of Trotsky's maturation as a revolutionary, takes a clear and unmistakably Marxist stand on the position of the United States of Europe. Sharply differentiating himself from the bourgeois demagogues who were also using the phrase, United States of Europe, but as a cover for imperialist depredations, Trotsky categorically identified the Marxist concept of the United States of Europe with the socialist dictatorship of the European

proletariat. In this earlier article Trotsky wrote:

"The victorious European revolution, however, no matter how its course in the sundry countries may be fashioned can, in consequence of the absence of other revolutionary classes, transfer the power only to the proletariat. Thus the United States of Europe represents the only conceivable form of the dictatorship of the European proletariat." (Reprinted in Fourth International, May 1942, p. 158. My emphasis-J.C.H.)

This identification of the United States of Europe with the dictatorship of the proletariat was fully in line with Lenin's writings on that subject. The idea of a United States of Europe under capitalism was repudiated by Lenin as either a myth or an imperialist bludgeon:

"From the point of view of the economic conditions of imperialism, i.e., capital export and division of the world between the 'progressive' and 'civilized' colonial powers, the United States of Europe under capitalism is either impossible or reactionary." (Collected Works, Vol. XVIII, pp. 269-270.)

Lenin even considered the term, United States of Europe, to be insufficiently broad, for he identified ^{the} concept in its final meaning with ^{the} stateless society of fully developed Communism and pointed to the United States of the World as the scientifically more correct term:

"The United States of the World (not of Europe alone) is a state

form of national unification and freedom which we connect with Socialism; we think of it as becoming a reality only when the full victory of Communism will have brought about the total disappearance of any state, including its democratic form." (Ibid., p. 271.)

In these terms of the international power of the proletarian dictatorship was the concept of the United States of Europe (or of the World) framed in the Marxist system in its classical writings.

With the growth of the bureaucratic degeneration of the leaders of the first workers' State, virtually every one of them made it a policy and a practice utterly to distort every Marxist concept. The degenerated leaders began to introduce policies which diverted the workers from the achievement of a Communist revolution and a proletarian dictatorship.

Since the Leninist concept of the United States of Europe is organically united with the dictatorship of the proletariat, the bureaucratic reprobates had to confuse the workers on the nature of the latter in order to confuse them on the nature of the former. We shall outline how this deception was engineered.

Through the course of the Russian Revolution, history had proved conclusively that there is no middle or transitional ground between a bourgeois and a proletarian dictatorship:

"The main thing the Socialists fail to understand and what constitutes their theoretical shortsightedness, their captivity to bourgeois prejudices and their political treachery to the proletariat, is that in capitalist society, as soon as there is any serious intensification of the class struggle on which it is based, there cannot be any middle course between the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and the dictatorship of the proletariat." (V. I. Lenin, Selected Works, Volume VII, p. 229. My emphasis - J.C.H.)

This formulation was meant not only as an analysis of state forms but also as a political directive warning against confusing some form of bourgeois dictatorship with the dictatorship of the proletariat. In the present epoch, any state which is not the dictatorship of the proletariat is necessarily the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie — such was the Leninist principle. Therefore, a real Workers, or Workers and Peasants Government can exist only under a proletarian dictatorship. In the early Soviet vocabulary, the term Workers or Workers and Peasants Government came to be used as a synonym for the dictatorship of the proletariat; the Russian Revolution and its aftermath in Europe pointed to and justified such usage.

What were the historical facts which established this usage? All governments formed by petty-bourgeois "labor" or "socialist" parties proved to be capitalist governments, agencies of world imperialism. These treacherous "labor" or "socialist" governments occasionally tried to palm themselves off as Workers or Workers and Peasants Governments, but this was mere demagoguery concealing their capitalist content. To this day the only genuine Workers, or Workers and Peasants Government that ever existed was the one formed through the dictatorship of the proletariat created by the Bolshevik Revolution of October 1917.

The bureaucratic renegades from Bolshevism, in line with their policy of diverting the toilers from proletarian revolution, began to give the workers the impression that there could exist real Workers, or Workers and Peasants Governments not under the dictatorship of the proletariat. The degenerated Soviet leaders began to issue cautiously-worded, equivocal formulations which spoke of a middle course between the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and the dictatorship of the proletariat, of "stages towards" the proletarian dictatorship, of "transitional phases" which would not be the proletarian dictatorship but nevertheless would be Workers, or Workers and Peasants Governments. Naturally, the object of the renegades was to en-

tangle the workers in support of these non-Bolshevik and therefore capitalist "Workers' Governments, thus pushing the toilers off the path of proletarian revolution.

The year 1923 marked a high stage of the Stalinist bureaucratic degeneration of the top leaders of the Soviet State. Lenin, who attempted to combat the Stalinist degeneration, was rapidly sinking out of the picture due to illness. Particularly in the early part of 1923 Lenin's illness mounted to a severe pitch, putting him out of all political work.

By 1923 the Stalinist renegades with their hands practically completely free had already firmly established the poisonous notion that Workers or Workers and Peasants Governments are possible on a non-proletarian-dictatorship basis.

Trotsky's article of the early Summer of 1923 on the United States of Europe coincides with this period. The line taken by Trotsky in this article reveals into what camp he had fallen. Sharply departing from his former revolutionary position of identifying the United States of Europe with the proletarian dictatorship, Trotsky now spoke of the United States of Europe as a possibility without the proletarian dictatorship. Trotsky now identified the United States of Europe with those alleged "Workers," or "Workers and Peasants" Governments which all the bureaucratic renegades were describing as not the actual dictatorship of the proletariat but a "stage towards" that dictatorship. His changed position on this vital question reads as follows:

"It might be argued that we are in reality speaking of a European Socialist Federation as part of a World Federation, and that such a regime can be brought about only by the dictatorship of the proletariat. We will not stop to answer this argument, since it was refuted by the international analysis during the consideration of the question of a 'Workers' Government.' The

United States of Europe' is a slogan in every respect corresponding with the slogan 'A Workers' (or Workers' and Peasants') Government. Is the realization of a 'Workers' Government' possible without the dictatorship of the proletariat? Only a conditional reply can be given to this question. In any case, we regard the 'Workers' Government' as a stage towards the dictatorship of the proletariat." (Reprinted in Fourth International, July 1942, p. 222. My emphasis - J.C.H.)

Note how carefully equivocal Trotsky was on the question whether a Workers Government is possible without the dictatorship of the proletariat. "Only a conditional reply can be given to this question," wrote the 1923 Trotsky. History had long given a categorical NO to this question, as Trotsky well knew; but now he had a reason -- the same reason Zinoviev, Stalin, Kamenev, Bukharin and the other renegades had who also gave a "conditional" reply to this question - for avoiding a direct Leninist answer. The "Workers Government" was now palmed off as "in any case" a "stage towards" the dictatorship of the proletariat. Since there is no middle ground between a bourgeois dictatorship and a proletarian dictatorship, it is clear that a "stage towards" the latter is in reality a bourgeois dictatorship. Thus Trotsky advanced the slogan of a United States of Europe as identical with the alleged "Workers' Government" which was said to be possible without the dictatorship of the proletariat. In brief, Trotsky now posed the United States of Europe under the regime of capitalism, a position repudiated by Lenin at all times, and by Trotsky when he too was a revolutionary.

What was involved here was not just a matter of a different formulation of a slogan. In that same year, 1923, the new policy which these new slogans represented was put into deadly effect on the international scene under the aegis of the degenerated leaders. The deceptive slogan "Workers Government" without the dictator-

ship of the proletariat, identified by Trotsky in 1923 with the idea of the United States of Europe, was used by the bureaucrats to confuse the workers on the difference between a bourgeois and a proletarian dictatorship.

It was in Germany, ripe for proletarian revolution in 1923, that these deceptions led to their first concrete, major and epoch-making betrayal of an imminent proletarian revolution, a piece of treachery engineered by the bureaucratic cancer in the Soviet Union which eventually came to be known as Stalinism. The bourgeois-democratic, parliamentary (Landtag) regimes of Saxony and Thuringia, where the upsurge of the workers was particularly intense, were painted up by the Soviet bureaucratic renegades as "Workers" Governments, a subtle deception reinforced by the trick of having three German Stalinist agents, Brandler, Thalheimer and Boettcher, participate in them in ministerial posts. Coalition bourgeois-democratic governments consisting of "Left" Social-Democrats, Right Social-Democrats (the Scheidemannites), and the few Stalinist bureaucrats as a tiny minority, were thus formed in the German capitalist state. in the Saxon and Thuringian bourgeois Parliaments.

In line with the policy of getting the workers to confuse a bourgeois with a proletarian dictatorship, Trotsky, in a speech during the fateful events of October 1923, equated the bourgeois-democratic, parliamentary coalition governments of Saxony and Thuringia with the Bolshevik government in which a few Left-S.R.'s participated as a small minority, a Soviet government established in Russia in 1918 after the proletarian overthrow of the capitalist regime and the creation of a proletarian dictat-

orship. Designating Brandler and his mates, who had gotten their instructions from the Stalin clique in the Kremlin, as "Communists," Trotsky said:-

"At the present time the situation is clear. The coalition of Communists with the Social Democrats in the government of Saxony and Thuringia is comparable to the coalition of the Communists and Left Social Revolutionaries in Russia." (Izvestia, Oct. 21, 1923.)

Trotsky, of course, knew perfectly well the difference between the bourgeois-parliamentary Landtag governments of Saxony and Thuringia and the dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia in 1918. His October 1923 deceptive equation of a bourgeois with a proletarian dictatorship was already contained in his article on the United States of Europe, written earlier that year, wherein he pretended there could be a Workers Government without the dictatorship of the proletariat. The whole fraud in turn was preceded by the fundamental degeneration of the Bolshevik leadership, a malignant process which consisted of the transformation of revolutionary leaders into power-usurping bureaucrats who first intrigued against the workers for permanent entrenchment in their high posts and then squabbled amongst themselves for the lion's share of power.

The smashing defeat of the German proletariat in 1923 due to the treacherous line foisted on them by Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Stalin, Bukharin and other deserters from Marxism paved the way for the recovery of imperialist power which led to the present assault on the Soviet Union.

J. C. Hunter
August 10, 1942

MYTHS AND FACTS ABOUT TROTSKY'S POSITION
ON THE ANGLO-RUSSIAN COMMITTEE

RECENTLY The Militant ran a column headed "Crimes of Stalin" by Lydia Beidel. The important feature of the column was a description of Trotsky's alleged struggle against Stalin's policies. One of the stoutest links in the chain of Trotsky's supposed fight was his attitude toward the Comintern policy in England, specifically on the question of the so-called Anglo-Russian Committee of Trade Union Unity formed by the Stalinist and the British trade union bureaucrats in 1925.

To those who are not familiar with the facts, the story of Trotsky's "fight" sounds plausible and true. But when the veil is lifted and Trotsky's actual policy is opened to view it becomes clear at once that the Trotskyite story is wide of the truth.

In May 1925 Stalin sent his high bureaucrat Tomsy, the head of the Russian trade unions, to London to launch the Committee. The policy of the Committee, shaped by Tomsy and other of Stalin's political clerks of the Comintern, was treacherous and counter-revolutionary from the start. The basic feature of this policy was to help the General Council of the British trade unions deceive the workers. After Trotsky was expelled from the Stalinist "Party" he wrote:

"From beginning to end, the entire policy of the Anglo-Russian Committee, because of its false

line, provided only aid to the General Council." (Leon Trotsky, Third International After Lenin, p. 131.)

This statement was written in 1928, after the Anglo-Russian Committee had already been dissolved. What, however, was Trotsky's line while the Committee was being formed, and during the height of its opportunist activity, especially at the most crucial moment in the British General Strike in 1926, and immediately after when the exposure of the Stalinist policies of the Comintern would have proved most effective?

The Trotskyite leaders always give the impression that Trotsky fought the Anglo-Russian Committee tooth and nail. Peculiarly enough, they have never cited a single statement of Trotsky's opposing its formation, or exposing it while it was betraying the General Strike. There is a good reason for this "omission": the part of the Trotskyite leaders. Such statements apparently do not exist. On the other hand, there are in existence statements by Trotsky of the Anglo-Russian Committee which Cannon and Shachtman are very careful not to produce or refer to. There is a very good reason for that omission too. These statements give support to the Anglo-Russian Committee and the Stalin-controlled Comintern.

At the end of January 1926, the

Congress of Soviet Textile Workers, dominated by the bureaucrats but attended by many workers, sent greetings to the Anglo-Russian Committee whose figure-heads were Tomsy and the British trade union bureaucrat, Purcell. It was the practice of the Stalinist bureaucrats to feed the workers all sorts of pseudo-scientific "explanations" of the Anglo-Russian Committee. The purpose was to conceal the opportunist origin and policy of the Committee. Among those spinning this kind of yarn was Trotsky who, concealing the Stalinist origin of the Anglo-Russian Committee, told the workers that the Committee grew out of the conditions in England:

"You, it appears, have sent today greetings to the Anglo-Russian Committee of unity of the trade unions. Wherefrom did it appear? It grew out of the economic decline of England." (Leon Trotsky, "Report at the Congress of Textile Workers, Pravda, January 31, 1926.")

Gifted with the power of stirring speech, Trotsky warmed to his subject and painted the Anglo-Russian Committee not as a treacherous trap laid by the Stalinist bureaucrats, but as the "highest expression" of the increasingly revolutionary situation in Europe and England:-

"If 25 years ago - and this is a short time - the Russian revolutionists of those days had proposed fraternization to the labor leaders, if the same Tomsy had been sent 20 years ago to London for unification with the English trade unions, they would have kicked him in the pants, naturally in a British not a Russian fashion. (Laughter) But at present the trade unions receive Tomsy in a brotherly manner. Wherein lies the reason? The reason is that the last decade undermined British industry; there is not a trace left of the privileged position of the working class and the English proletariat is becoming politically proletarianized. He seeks a new support, and it is no accident that he finds it first of all in our Soviet trade unions. The Anglo-Rus-

sian Committee of unity of trade unions is the highest expression of that shift in the situation in all Europe, and especially in England, which is occurring before our eyes and which is leading toward the European revolution." (Leon Trotsky, Report at the Congress of Textile Workers, Pravda January 31, 1926.)

Trotsky thus drew a veil of obscurity and falsehood over the true political quality of Tomsy and his visit to Purcell, Hicks and other trade union bureaucrats of Great Britain. As did the Comintern bureaucrats, Trotsky also gave a Stalinist dose of opium on the historical origin and significance of the Anglo-Russian Committee.

Splashed on the pages of the Stalinist press, these statements of Trotsky served not as a warning and an enlightenment to the workers but as a brightly colored mirage to lure them to the treacherous trap set up by the Stalinist Comintern for the British masses. Be it remembered that Trotsky painted this mirage long after the Anglo-Russian Committee had been established, and only about three months before the dark policy of Stalin's Comintern in England reached its black climax. It goes without saying that the most crucial part of the proletariat which was deceived by Trotsky was that section which already doubted Stalin and his Tomsys and had implicit faith in Trotsky, the leader of the supposed Opposition.

In the Spring of 1926 Trotsky went to Germany for an operation. While he was in Berlin the British General Strike took place. The climactic moment had arrived. One word of criticism, of exposure from Trotsky, who at that time was still an influential figure in the Comintern, and the advanced workers would have been shaken out of their Stalinist trance. But while the trap set up by the bureaucracy was closing over the head of the British proletariat, there was no word of criticism or warning from Trotsky. One must not think, however, that during those days Trotsky main-

tained silence about the situation in England. He wrote an article during the General Strike giving the workers not exposure of Stalin, of the Anglo-Russian Committee and the Purcell's, the "Left" bureaucrats of the British Labor Party, but rather a dose of reassuring Stalinist opium which the Stalinist editors with alacrity featured in the publications of the Comintern. Trotsky said:

"Within the Labour Party, the revolutionary wing will increase in influence and will find more complete expression. The Communists will push forward resolutely. The revolutionary development of England will advance enormously." (Trotsky, Innocent, June 10, 1926.)

This was written a few days before the striking British workers were stabbed by the General Council which was backed by the Anglo-Russian Committee, which in turn was covered up by the "Oppositionist" Trotsky. The Stalinist editors in a note prefacing Trotsky's reassuring article stated:

"The following was written by Comrade Trotsky on May 6, i.e., six days before the calling off of the general strike by the General Council. Ed."

That is how Trotsky "fought" the Comintern's policy in England.

But this is not all. According to a statement in his autobiography while in the Berlin clinic, he followed the General Strike closely:-

"I eagerly gathered and collated in the clinic all the information about the course of the General Strike and especially about the relations between the masses and their leader." (My Life, p. 528.)

Trying to give the impression in his autobiography that he bitterly fought the Stalin gang on the General Strike, Trotsky continues with the remark:

"The thing that made my gorge rise was the nature of the articles in the Moscow Pravda." (Ibid.)

Again, it must be remembered, this was written some years after the events, in 1929. What, however, was Trotsky's line during the events of 1926? One would imagine that if his "gorge rose," as he says, he would have taken steps, either in Berlin or upon his return to Russia, to expose the machinations of the Stalinist "Comintern." What did he say to the international proletariat immediately when this "Comintern" policy was felt with painful intenseness when treachery triumphed and the bitterly disillusioned revolutionary workers saw capitalism entrenched in England more solidly than before?

Trotsky returned to the Soviet Union shortly after the sell-out of the General Strike, and at his first important public appearance he delivered a spirited address in which he dealt with the "Comintern" policy in England. The occasion was the Third All-Union Conference of Workers and Peasants Correspondents. The affair, of course, was dominated by Stalin's bureaucrats, but the atmosphere in the country was electric. Many workers who felt the heavy hand of the Stalinist bureaucracy and suspected that the "Comintern" employed tactics and policies opposite from those practiced by the Bolshevik Party in 1917, were particularly eager to learn Trotsky's opinion. It must be borne in mind that Trotsky spoke after the betrayal of the General Strike, after a whole series of Stalinist misdeeds, crimes and betrayals which by the middle of 1926 were already piled very high. In order to give a rounded view of Trotsky's pro-Stalinist policy of presenting the corrupt and bureaucratized "Comintern" as a true Bolshevik organization we deem it necessary to cite a considerable section of his speech. This citation must be read very attentively, and particular heed be paid to the portion where he spoke of the Stalinized "Comintern" of 1926 transferring to England "the same principles and methods" as those of the authentic Bolsheviks of 1917:-

"That grandiose upsurge which our country lived through during the days of the English general

strike was in truth a great demonstration of the closest connection of the toiling masses of our union with the life and struggle of the English proletariat and the world working class as a whole.

"Then our workers were collecting money and our trade unions sent it to the strikers the English bourgeois press wrote that the Russians are supporting the strike out of patriotic considerations in order to tear down British economy. Curiously, a few weeks prior to the strike, the British almost-Socialist Bertrand Russell wrote 'All the Bolshevik judgments and advices regarding revolutionary development of England are dictated by patriotism. The Russians want to draw England into a revolutionary uprising, to cause its decline in order thus to stabilize their own situation.'

"These gentlemen forget that in 1917 to us in the Petrograd of that period there arrived one of the English almost-Socialists, Arthur Henderson, one of the false leaders and factual betrayers of the recent general strike, and spoke for instance thus: The Bolsheviks are betrayers of Russia, they serve German imperialism, in their soul there is not a drop of healthy national feeling and patriotism. The Mensheviks and S.R.'s - these are the patriots that support the struggle for state independence and democracy.

"Such was the voice of official British socialism in 1917 in the sharpest moment when the Bolshevik party was struggling against the imperialist war. And now, when the Comintern transfers the same principles and methods upon the English soil reflecting the objective course of events, the condition of British economy, growth of contradictions, the inextricable condition of the English proletariat within collapsing capitalism - when all these circumstances transfer the methods of Bolshevism upon the English soil then this very Henderson together with the 'Daily Mail'

on the one side, with Russell on the other, no longer says that the Bolsheviks are traitors and betrayers of their fatherland. No. He says the Bolsheviks are the most cunning patriots, they serve the Great-Russian nationalist idea, they want to continue the Tsarist policy and dig under the might of old Britain. These gentlemen twist, lie, turn themselves inside out. But we remain the same. Whether Messrs Hendersons will call us traitors to Russia or the most bloodthirsty Russian patriots does not affect us. We were, are and will remain the same. If we are patriots, we are patriots of the working class including the British, we are patriots of the international proletarian revolution. (Stormy Applause)." (Leon Trotsky, Pravda, June 2, 1926. Speech before the Third All-Union Conference of Workers and Peasants Correspondents. My emphasis - G.M.)

That is how Trotsky consciously and deliberately lied to the workers of the whole world about the nature of the "principles" of Stalin's Comintern line on the soil of England, falsely calling them "the same principles and methods" as those used by the Bolsheviks of 1917. The stormy applause this poisonous Stalinist protector received only indicates how perfectly in line with Stalinism Trotsky worked. "We remain the same," Trotsky told the Stalinist-guided Workers and Peasants Correspondents. "We" in this case could be understood not otherwise than to mean not only himself but also Stalin, Tomsy, and all the other degenerated leaders of the revolution. No, "We" did not remain the same! "We" became different. "We" plotted during Lenin's illness for self-entrenchment in power, and then intrigued against one another for the major portion of power. "We," - Stalin, Trotsky, Zinoviev and others - became opportunists and bureaucrats, deceivers and betrayers of the proletariat.

Now it can be seen clearly that Trotsky's story in his autobiography in 1929 about his gorge rising because

of Pravda's articles on the General Strike is sheer hypocrisy.

Unless Trotsky's whole role in the rise of Stalinism is known, his role in any specific situation is very difficult to understand. As we have shown in previous documents, Trotsky originally strove to share power with the Stalin gang. He concealed their crimes, supported all their policies, deceived Lenin and the workers, and helped entrench the renegade leaders in their positions of usurped power. The Stalin clique, however, double-crossed Trotsky and entered upon a factional campaign to centralize all power in its own hands. Trotsky was converted into a factional target and scapegoat. Tied irrevocably to Stalinism, Trotsky continued to support its policies. Thus, to take the example we have outlined above, out before the workers, Trotsky stood solid with the Stalin clique on the Anglo-Russian Committee and the British General Strike. The drive of the Stalin gang against him, nevertheless, forced him to resort to factional measures of self-defense. One such measure was a proposal, made in secret behind the scenes, after the betrayal of the British General Strike, that the Anglo-Russian Committee be dissolved. The Cannons and Shachtmans make a great to-do over this demand. They try to make it appear proof that Trotsky fought against Stalin on the question of the Anglo-Russian Committee and the General Strike. This fraudulent pretense, of course, is based on a concealment of Trotsky's actual support of Stalin and of the sham, factional nature of his "oppositional" gesture. As if the root of the betrayal lay in the formation of the Anglo-Russian Committee and not in the Stalinist degeneration of the Comintern! As if with the dissolution of the Anglo-Russian Committee, Stalin's "Comintern" could not and did not betray the workers again through many other devices!

The Trotskyite leaders, like Lydia Beidel, twist facts and build illusory views in the minds of the workers. Cannon, Shachtman and the others are quite aware that Trotsky did not move a finger to protect the British work-

ers from betrayal.

The Trotskyite leaders give a clever twist to this important issue by circumventing Trotsky's actual policy which he carried on when the Anglo-Russian Committee was founded and during the betrayal of the General Strike by diverting the workers' attention from the damning facts. They speak of the "Opposition" being "correct" in its demand to dissolve the Committee - after the betrayal. Here is their maneuver:-

"The Opposition was absolutely correct when it demanded the immediate rupture of the Anglo-Russian Committee and the concentration of all the fire of the Comintern and the British Party upon the leaders of the British Trade Union General Council (Purcell, Hicks and Co.) immediately after the betrayal of the general strike." (Statement by Cannon, Abern and Shachtman, The Militant, November 15, 1928. My emphasis - G.M.)

This maneuver also contains a subtle lie hidden in the words "immediately after." Where is the record, the substantiating evidence that Trotsky immediately after the betrayal demanded the rupture of Stalinism with the British trade union swindlers? Cannon, Shachtman and others, offer none, for apparently, there is not a document to prove this. On the other hand, there is the Pravda of June 2, 1926, showing Trotsky's actual line on Stalin's Comintern, establishing beyond peradventure of a doubt that immediately after the betrayal Trotsky covered up the criminal Stalinist "Comintern" with "Bolshevik" veneer and deceived the workers by concentrating their resentment upon the British trade union betrayers and diverting their minds from the chief culprit, the Stalinist Comintern.

We can cite many Trotskyist distortions of a similar pattern. For illustration we shall give two more in connection with the Anglo-Russian Committee. In 1925 Trotsky wrote a book, Whither England. There was nothing unusual about that work.

Trotsky traced some developments of England, its past history, its position in world economy since the war. The book contained stock criticism of British reformism, basically the criticism employed by the Bolsheviks years before. The book was in no sense a threat to Stalin. Quite conspicuously Trotsky omitted all reference to the Comintern's policies in England. From the point of necessity of setting the workers' minds on guard against the Stalinist gang directing the Soviet Union and the Comintern, the book is positively a convenient blind behind which Stalin could conduct his machinations unobserved by the workers. Stalin and his clique received from Trotsky the manuscript of the work. They found no objection at all to its publication. As a matter of fact, they did not even suggest any changes, so completely and perfectly acceptable was the book insofar as the interests of the Stalin clique were concerned.

Writing his autobiography four years later, following his exile from the Soviet Union, Trotsky felt, as he was describing the period of the General Strike, that the reader would expect some evidence of his alleged fight against the policy of Stalin's Comintern. Since there is not a word or even mildest criticism of the Comintern policy in any of his writings for 1924, 1925 and the first part of 1926, Trotsky was unable to furnish any documentary proof of his alleged struggle against Stalin's policy in the Anglo-Russian Committee for that period. So Trotsky decided to palm off his book Whither England as a work directed against Stalin's "conception" of evolution to the left of the British General Council. If one scans every sentence in Whither England through a magnifying lense he won't be able to detect even a remotest indication that Trotsky was posing a view different from that held by Stalin. On the other hand, Trotsky felt constrained to acknowledge that his manuscript was not a "criticism after the fact" and was not condemned as a "Trotskyist" work. Trotsky wrote:

"During the winter and spring of

1925, while I was in the Caucasus, I wrote a book on this- 'Whither England?' The book was aimed essentially at the official conception of the Politbureau with its hope of an evolution to the left by the British General Council, and of a gradual and painless penetration of communism into the ranks of the British Labor Party and trade unions. In part to avoid unnecessary complications, in part to check up on my opponents, I submitted the manuscript of the book to the Politbureau. Since it was a question of forecast, rather than of criticism after the fact, none of the members of the Politbureau ventured to express himself. The book passed safely by the censors and was published exactly as it had been written. A little later, it also appeared in English." (My Life p. 527. My emphasis - G.M.)

That Trotsky's story about his line of aiming at Stalin's "conception" of penetration of "Communism" within the British Labor Party is untrue can be gleaned from his writings during the General Strike, cited earlier, his statement that "Within the Labor Party, the revolutionary wing will increase in influence and will find more complete expression. The Communists will push forward resolutely." The book was a Stalinist work from the first word to the last.

Imagining that the more time that elapses from the moment a certain event occurs the greater is the fog enveloping that event, the Trotskyite leaders grow bolder in their falsifications as the years go by. Lydia Beidel goes a great deal further than her Master and writes the lie that in Whither England Trotsky warned against "every move" coming in the approaching betrayal of the workers, and brazenly adds that the work was condemned by Stalin as a piece of "Trotskyism":

"Anticipating the disaster to come from Stalin's opportunism, Trotsky wrote a bitingly critical work entitled 'Whither England,' in

THE TROTSKY SCHOOL

which he warned against every move which was to come in the ensuing disaster; it was condemned by Stalin as more evidence of 'criminal Trotskyism.' (L. Beidel, The Militant, November 8, 1941, p. 6.)

Thus, while Cannon, Shachtman and all the Beidels feed to the vanguard

workers sheer fabrications about Trotsky's line on the Anglo-Russian Committee, indelible facts tell a different story, revealing Trotsky's political collaboration with the renegade Stalin in betraying the British masses.

George Marlen

NOW COLLECTED AND BOUND IN ONE VOLUME -

THE TROTSKY SCHOOL OF FALSIFICATION - PART I

THE ARTICLES WHICH APPEARED IN THIS SECTION OF THE BULLETIN ARRANGED IN HISTORICAL ORDER. - PRESENTING A MANY-SIDED EXPOSURE OF TROTSKY'S OPPORTUNIST ROLE IN THE RISE OF STALINISM. - DOCUMENTARY PROOF OF TROTSKY'S SUPPORT TO STALIN IN THE BUROCRATIC DEGENERATION OF THE SOVIET UNION AND THE COMINTERN.

SEND FOR A FREE COPY.

Address:
P.O. Box
Station
New York

SOME LIGHT
ON A
CROOKED DEAL

KNOW them by the blocs they make is the translation into political terms of an old and familiar proverb. A highly revealing episode in the career of Trotsky's so-called "Opposition" in the Soviet Union was his bloc with Zinoviev and Kamenev in the years 1926-27. This incident is especially interesting in light of the fact that Zinoviev and Kamenev were originally clique partners of Stalin. Zinoviev and Kamenev (with Stalin at first in the background) were, moreover, the authors of the faction fight opened in the Autumn of 1923 to oust Trotsky from power and so initiate a bureaucratic centralization process to their own advantage. This pair of eminent bureaucrats was profoundly involved in the degeneration of the Bolshevik leadership.

How did it happen that at a certain stage they entered into a bloc with Trotsky against whom for three years they had been waging a bitter clique fight? The Trotsky leaders have given an explanation of this startling about-face in rather simple terms. Shachtman in an old pamphlet on the history of the Trotsky faction puts it this way:

"The first two years of struggle of the Opposition finally bore fruit in the revolt of the revolutionary Leningrad proletariat in 1925, which compelled its leaders—men like Zinoviev who had fathered the campaign against 'Trotskyism'—to combine in a bloc with the 1923 Opposition." (Ten Years, The History of the Left Opposition, p. 54)

Shachtman, of course, is only repeating the official explanation issued by Trotsky himself. A later example of this explanation was given by Trotsky before the Dewey Commission:

"They were under the pressure of

workers, of the best workers we had—of Petrograd and Moscow—the most developed and most educated workers. Stalin's support was in the provinces, the bureaucracy in the provinces. At first they did not themselves understand—that is, Zinoviev and Kamenev, as others also—why the split came. But it was the pressure of the workers of both capitals. The pressure of the workers pushed Zinoviev and Kamenev into contradictions with Stalin. (The Case of Leon Trotsky, p. 81)

As we see, according to the official story of the Trotsky leaders, the pressure of the workers who followed Zinoviev and Kamenev caused these clique partners of Stalin to turn about 180 degrees and unite with Trotsky and his "Opposition."

If this is all that one knows about the matter, it sounds quite plausible. In contrast to this official version, however, Trotsky on other occasions was constrained to paint quite a different picture of this incident.

According to this other version, the workingclass followers of Zinoviev and Kamenev had exerted no pressure whatever, and what is more, they were strenuously opposed to any bloc with Trotsky. For three years, Zinoviev and Kamenev had been poisoning their followers against Trotsky, so that when the bloc with him was broached from the top, even Zinoviev's petty henchmen were absolutely flabbergasted, at a loss to comprehend, and harshly against it. Trotsky in a letter of November 1927 testifies that Zinoviev himself told him how hard it was to convince his followers to agree to the bloc with Trotsky. In order to facilitate this bloc, Zinoviev had "admitted" that he had been wrong in attacking Trotsky. Here is what happen-

ed:

"In this manner, Zinoviev admitted his mistake of 1923 (in waging a struggle against 'Trotskyism' and even characterized it as much more dangerous than that of 1917 (when he opposed the October insurrection)).

"This admission on the part of Zinoviev aroused considerable astonishment among many second-rank leaders of the Leningrad Opposition who were not initiated into the conspiracy and who honestly believed in the legend of 'Trotskyism.'

"Zinoviev told me repeatedly: 'In Leningrad we hammered it into the minds of the comrades more deeply than anywhere else and it is, therefore, most difficult to reeducate them.'" (L. Trotsky, The Stalin School of Falsification, p. 91)

So far were Zinoviev's followers from exerting pressure on him that it was a tough job to "reeducate" them to the idea of joining up with Trotsky!

In fact, Zinoviev's proposal for a bloc with Trotsky actually put the former in danger of losing his supporters. Trotsky himself is the witness testifying to this effect:

"On the other hand, the advanced Petrograd workers, followers of Zinoviev, who had engaged honestly and seriously in the struggle against 'Trotskyism' could by no means reconcile themselves to the sudden turn of 180 degrees. Zinoviev was confronted with the danger of losing the best elements of his own faction." (The New International, February 1938, p. 57)

What is the meaning of these sharply contradictory stories and what is the real reason for the bloc formed by Zinoviev-Kamenev with Trotsky? The story of the "pressure of the workers" is sheer hokum. History records no such pressure on Zinoviev and Kamenev and what is more, even Trotsky himself gives the lie to this yarn. On other occasions, Trotsky let slip still another version which not only explodes

the myth about the "pressure of the workers," but points to the real reasons for Zinoviev-Kamenev's move for a bloc with Trotsky. Stalin had accumulated enormous power and his partners, Zinoviev-Kamenev, saw that they were about to be elbowed out. They therefore cast about for some maneuver to recoup their lost bureaucratic fortunes. A bloc with Trotsky, in 1926 still a big figure before the Soviet masses, seemed a shrewd trick to Zinoviev and Kamenev. The latter pair imagined that by pooling their stocks with Trotsky's they would be able to counterbalance Stalin's mounting power. Trotsky many years after the event related this real source of the bloc of 1926-27:

"They came over to the Opposition, hoping to gain power in a short lapse of time. Toward this end they joined with the 1923 Opposition." (The New International, Nov. 1934, p. 109)

In other words, the whole thing was a factional maneuver at the top. Small wonder that the workers at bottom, completely in the dark at what was going on in the leading circles, were actually shocked by the Zinoviev-Kamenev bloc with Trotsky.

There is one more point, a particularly choice one, connected with this episode which is worth relating. For sheerly factional reasons, as a trick to decrease Trotsky's power and prestige, Zinoviev and Kamenev in 1923 had launched an attack on Trotsky's theory of the Permanent Revolution, originally formulated many years earlier in the pre-1917 period. Zinoviev and Kamenev took advantage of the fact that Lenin prior to 1917 had mistakenly attacked Trotsky's theory. We emphasize the word mistakenly to differentiate Lenin's pre-1917 attack which was the result of an honest error, from Zinoviev and Kamenev's 1923 attack which was a deliberate, criminal clique maneuver to demolish Trotsky as a figure in the Soviet Union. Lenin's old anti-Trotsky remarks were exhumed and constantly paraded before the workers by Zinoviev, Kamenev and Stalin after 1923, and the fact that in 1917 Lenin

had adopted Trotsky's theory in practice was concealed. The result was that when Zinoviev-Kamenev in 1926 proposed the bloc with Trotsky, their followers raised a protest: What about Trotsky's theory of Permanent Revolution? For quite a while Zinoviev and Kamenev have been shouting that this is a Menshevik theory and now they want to form a bloc with Trotsky!

Zinoviev and Kamenev had to worm their way out of this embarrassing situation. The scheme they hit upon was really simple, like so many great crimes. They "merely" got Trotsky to repudiate his theory of the Permanent Revolution! By declaring publicly that in the past controversies over this theory Lenin—who had actually been wrong—was right, and Trotsky—who had actually been right—was wrong, Trotsky officially washed his hands of this great Marxist principle. His declaration to this effect was even written into the Platform of the Opposition, the "theoretical" vehicle of the Zinoviev-Kamenev-Trotsky bloc:

"Trotsky has stated to the International that in all those questions of principle upon which he disputed with Lenin, Lenin was right—and particularly upon the question of the permanent revolution and the

peasantry." (See The Real Situation in Russia, p. 180)

That this was nothing but a maneuver to cover Zinoviev's treacherous tracks also can be proved directly by Trotsky's own words:

"With my acknowledgement of Lenin's correctness, Zinoviev sought, if only partially, to throw a veil over the previous criminal 'ideological' work of his own faction against me." (L. Trotsky, The New International, February 1938, p. 57)

In such a shameful way was a fundamental Marxist position traded over the counter in the formation of the Zinoviev-Kamenev-Trotsky bloc.

We have reached the real essence of Trotsky's bloc with Zinoviev and Kamenev, a clique maneuver absolutely devoid of principle. We have come a long way in these few pages from the official Trotskyite fable about the "pressure of the workers" with which this article begins. But we close with the political proverb with which we started: Know them by the blocs they make.

J.C.H.
March 1945

Compiled PART I The Trotsky School of Falsification

TROTSKY "TEACHES" PARTY DISCIPLINE
TROTSKY'S "ADVICE" TO THE RUSSIAN WORKERS
THE POLITICAL NATURE OF THE TROTSKY-ZINOVIEV BLOC
THE MOTIVES OF ZINOVIEV AND KAMENEV
THE POLITICAL MORALS OF THE TROTSKYITE LEADERS
* * *

PAGES FROM TROTSKY'S POLITICAL HISTORY
DID TROTSKY COLLABORATE WITH STALIN
(A Reply to J. R. Johnson of the Workers Party)
THE CANNONITES "ANSWER" THE SHACHTMANITES
ADDRESS: P.O. 67, Station D

SEND FOR FREE COPIES

"GERMANY IS NOT ITALY"

In the years 1930, 1931 and 1932 the German bourgeois-democratic imperialists were building up their Fascist forces in order to place them in power and thus stabilize tottering German capitalism along the lines of Italian Fascism. The German toiling masses, having before their eyes the ghastly example of Italy, were greatly perturbed. Unfortunately, like the Italian workers, the German toilers were deceived and paralyzed by opportunist political parties. The Social Democracy, misleading the working class since 1914, was faithfully serving German imperialism. The Stalinist "Party" was a trap to prevent proletarian revolution, for the purpose of protecting the bureaucratic rulers of the Soviet Union from any upsurge of the masses.

The militant, Bolshevik-intentioned workers followed the Stalinist "Party," falsely imagining they were following a real Bolshevik organization. Thus, the Stalinist "Party" stood in the foreground as the main trap for the millions of advanced German workers. In the absence of a Bolshevik Party their fate was sealed.

A very important weapon in the hands of Stalinism to allay the fears of the workers was the ideological chloroform contained in the formula "Germany is not Italy." The feeling of false security which this deadly illusion induced was kept alive by the Stalinist bureaucrats all along while Hitler was gathering his strength. Had the German masses realized that, as matters were shaping-up, Germany would follow the Italian road, they would have been seized with a sharp sense of impending calamity and, probably, would have staged a spontaneous rising

against the Nazis, something similar to the rising in Vienna in 1927. To prevent a rising of the masses of Germany against the growing forces of reaction, Stalinism, as well as Social Democracy, had to deliver the mightiest working class in capitalist Europe to Hitler in a quiet, completely passive way. "Germany is not Italy" was the soothing refrain that lulled the German workers into believing that Germany could not and would not follow the Italian road.

It may be stated with absolute certainty that in the first few weeks of his rule Hitler was trodding upon extremely dangerous ground. He was consolidating his grip upon the State machinery, but the millions of German proletarians were not yet crushed by his assassin bands. The bloody work on a mass scale was yet to be a thing of the future. To fool the workers into believing he was not following the path of Italy, he announced new elections for March 5, 1933. And although Fascist intimidation and terror had begun to show their familiar fangs, five million Stalinist workers went to the polls, directed and controlled now by the Hitlerites, and voted for the Stalinist bureaucrats still trusting the comforting lie that Germany would not follow the example of Italy.

Immediately after the March 1933 trumped-up "elections," Hitler took vigorous steps to wipe out in blood the proletarian vanguard of Germany. Had the class-conscious, Fascist-hating masses of Germany even at that late hour realized clearly that the country was being dragged by Hitler along the path carved out by Mussolini for Italy, there might have been a spontaneous resistance to Hitler. An uprising of the German proletariat would have

shaken the whole of Europe and unleashed a force which would have been very difficult for the opportunists to control. But the ideological paralysis spread by Stalinism, Social Democracy and other reactionary forces, the ingrained belief that somehow history was diverting Germany from the Italian road, was too powerful to overcome without a campaign of Marxist enlightenment and exposure of the betrayers. The great toiling masses of Germany lay supine before Hitler, prevented from offering resistance while he was remodeling the German State upon the Italian pattern. Even at that most terrible moment for the German workers, the Stalinist bureaucracy continued spreading the vicious, mesmerizing idea — "Germany is not Italy." The German Stalinist leader, Fritz Heckert, safely outside the Nazi scope of terror, pumped into the minds of the workers the opium that German Fascism was different from Italian Fascism. In a widely distributed pamphlet he said:

"German fascism cannot be compared with Italian fascism." (What Is Happening In Germany, p. 12.)

And the well-known Stalinist bureaucrat, O. Piatnitsky, assured the workers that "Germany in 1933 is not like Italy in 1922." (The Present Situation in Germany, p. 42.)

THE line of the Comintern bureaucracy is plain enough. Now, what was the Trotskyite line on this Stalinist deception?

During those days of consolidation of the Fascist power in Germany, the following piece of deadly delusion was impressed upon the revolutionary workers by people who call themselves Marxists, helping Stalin to stifle the suspicions that Germany was actually following the Italian road:

"It would be patently stupid to believe that the subsequent evolution of Germany will go the Italian

road; that Hitler will strengthen his domination step by step without serious resistance."

This soothing chloroform served Hitler, Mussolini and world imperialism, as well as the Stalinist bureaucracy whose grip might have been shaken had the German masses realized the truth and risen against Hitler. And who was it that penned the above-given poisonous citation? Perhaps some "frightened," "helpless" miserable Stalinist pen-pusher of the Daily Worker? No, it was written by Leon Trotsky, and published by Cannon and Shachtman in The Militant of April 8, 1933.

Aided from every direction, Hitler smashed the proletariat and massacred thousands of the best workers of Germany. Naturally in the face of the obvious development of Germany along the Italian road, the deceptive noise about Germany not being Italy had to be dropped. And just as the Comintern bureaucrats were unable to conceal the truth about the German development and changed their story, so Trotsky and his Cannons and Shachtmans inside of a few weeks also changed the Stalinist tune that "Germany is not Italy" and wrote in an exactly opposite vein: "German Fascism slavishly follows the Italian example." (The Militant, May 20, 1933.)

Unfortunately for the deceived masses, the German situation by then had passed the most crucial point of possibility of proletarian resistance, growing safer daily for Hitler and world imperialism. Then, in their usual vein of sham criticism of the Comintern's disruptive line, the Trotskyites wrote harsh words concerning the deadly opiate "Germany is not Italy":

"Germany Is Not Italy"

"A damnable and blighting catch phrase ran through the ranks of the German proletariat, wandering through all the organizations of the working class. They consoled each other with it. It was thought up and set in circulation by

frightened, helpless bureaucrats, at their wits' end. 'Germany is not Italy', 'Germany is not Italy', - in pompous and heroic speeches and in pompous newspaper articles, the numberless newspapers thrown again and again at the masses. 'Germany is not Italy.' (The Militant, June 24, 1933.)

People hard to convince of the truth might imagine that the whole matter was just an "error" that crept into the Trotskyite line and that no dishonesty is involved in so far as the Trotskyites are concerned. But the facts speak otherwise. During the succeeding years the Trotskyites diligently pointed an accusing finger at others: "Ah, but Germany is going to be different from Italy. The Stalinist hacks turned out reams on this theme." (The Militant, February 8, 1941.) But about the support by Trotsky and Cannon and Shachtman to the deadly Stalinist fraud in the terrible days immediately after Hitler's 1933 "elections" not a single word! Cannon and Shachtman published Trotsky's piece of Stalinist poison, never repudiating it, not even attempting to comment upon it! And about a year after March 5, 1933 the Secretariat headed by Trotsky declared without batting an eyelash:

"THE CORRECTNESS OF OUR methods, our PREDICTIONS and our slogans have been incontestably proved through the entire historic development of the last ten years." (The Militant, March 31, 1934.)

Is it honest to lie to the workers that "the correctness" of "our predictions" "have been incontestably proved"? If there were a spark of revolutionary integrity in these people they would at least have pointed out their predictions that definitely proved wrong — of which there were quite a number. But instead of making a correction, as honest people would do, Cannon and Shachtman with a defiant air declared brazenly:

"On the fifth anniversary of our paper Militant we repent nothing and retract nothing." (The Militant, Editorial, Nov. 18, 1933.)

Thus Cannon and Shachtman in effect declared the following: We, the Trotskyite leaders, handed out misleading, deadly ideas which aided Stalin and imperialism to blind the workers to the fact that Hitler was following the road of Mussolini. Nevertheless we do not regret we did that, we are not apologizing to anybody, and make no amends of any sort! — "We repent nothing and retract nothing."

Indeed, the methods of Cannon and Shachtman are the methods of Stalinism: to paint false pictures for the workers, to conceal this fact and attempt to appear as "Marxists." They act as if their consciences are clear and "integrity" is unimpaired. On the sixth anniversary of The Militant, the instrument through which Cannon and Shachtman were disseminating destructive confusion among the workers, they lied as follows:

"In six years the Militant had gained the respect of the entire revolutionary movement of the world for its HONESTY, its clean methods and above all for the clarity and correctness of its policies." (The Militant, December 8, 1934. My emphasis and capitals - G.M.)

Why is there such a multitude of cynical lies, evasions, equivocations and arrogance in the Trotskyite political system? Why do the Cannons and Shachtmans build a Chinese wall of falsification around their own political history? Because upon this falsification, evasion and insolence their "movements" rest. Their "parties" will collapse like rotten hulks when the workers discover that the real foundation of the Cannon and the Shachtman "movements" is support to Stalinist and other reactionary deceptions, hypocritical self-praise, political dishonesty — when the victims of Cannon and Shachtman learn that their "leaders" are a set of adroit "revolutionary" adventurers who, together with the Stalinist and Social Democratic bureaucrats, have been for years pulling wool over the workers' eyes.

G. M.
October 1943

WHAT TROTSKY TAUGHT ABOUT HITLERISM

THE Trotsky leaders never tire of repeating the story that their program was confirmed in the German crisis which marked the accession of the Nazis to power on January 30, 1933. In an article "How Trotsky Taught Labor to Fight Against Hitlerism," The Militant of February 12, 1944 turns to this favorite theme. In this particular article, The Militant prints statements by Trotsky written prior to the accession of Hitler to power and dealing with the rising Hitler movement. The Militant claims that Trotsky's predictions and program stood the test of history:

"The eleven years of Hitler's rule which led to the most terrible war in history and the Nazi assault upon the USSR have tested and confirmed the truth of Trotsky's predictions and his program. That program holds with full force today." (P. 3. Emphasis in original)

Let us check this story of The Militant in the order presented; first, Trotsky's predictions on the fascist menace, secondly, the program he laid down on this question, and thirdly whether that program holds today.

TROTSKY'S PREDICTIONS

IN the years prior to, and at the time of Hitler's accession to power, it was the common practice of the Stalinists and Social Democrats to spread the disastrous illusion that the fascist movement in Germany could not travel the path to supreme domination that the Mussolini movement did in Italy. This comforting opium was summed up in the catch-phrase well-known at that time: "Germany is not Italy." Did Trotsky differentiate himself in his predictions from those who spread these lies? A study of Trotsky's predictions on this matter shows he repeated them to the letter. Here

is a statement of his written a month after Hitler took power:

"It would be patently stupid to believe that the subsequent evolution of Germany will go the Italian road; that Hitler will strengthen his domination step by step without serious resistance." (L. Trotsky, The Militant, April 8, 1933)

Actually Germany did evolve along the Italian road, and Hitler did strengthen his domination without meeting serious resistance due to the complete paralysis of the German proletariat induced by its opportunist leadership. A little more than a month after Trotsky's reassuring statement, the Trotsky leaders acknowledged that "German fascism slavishly follows the Italian example." (The Militant, May 20, 1933) And when on June 24, 1933, The Militant subjected the thesis that "Germany is not Italy" to severe criticism, attributing this line to the Social Democratic and Stalinist leaders, it kept mum on Trotsky's own misleading prediction on this score.

After Hitler assumed the Chancellorship, Trotsky went so far as to state that it was impossible for the German bourgeoisie to give the actual power to the Nazis:

"There is no way of getting around without the Nazis. But it is likewise impossible to give over to them the actual power; today, the threat on the part of the proletariat is not so acute that the higher-ups should consciously provoke a civil war with problematic outcome." (L. Trotsky, The Militant, February 24, 1933. My emphasis - A. B.)

This patently false prediction of Trotsky's and his participation in the "Germany is not Italy" campaign is dishonestly omitted in The Militant's re-

view of Trotsky's line in the German situation. It would be evidently absurd to write how history has "confirmed the truth of Trotsky's predictions" and include the false and misleading predictions of Trotsky which we quoted. Obviously the prime concern of The Militant is simply to sanctify Trotsky as an infallible prophet who gave correct leadership to the workers. Necessarily along these lines, facts must be hurried and fiction advanced as truth.

TROTSKY'S PROGRAM

THE prospect which Trotsky gave the advanced workers prior to 1933 was that the Stalinist party must be corrected and set on the Marxist path. The hopes of Trotsky's followers were wrapped around this view. Trotsky repudiated any talk of the workers taking the independent path of a new international directed against the Stalinized Third International. After his exile from the Soviet Union, Trotsky declared:

"All talk of my planning a 4th International is sheer nonsense. The Social Democratic International, just as the Communist International have deep historical roots. No intermediary (2¹/₂) or additional (IV) International will be needed. There is no room for them." (Bulletin of the Opposition, #1-2, p. 29)

Such was Trotsky's program — which The Militant boasts "holds with full force today."

Stalin and his bureaucrats, facing the danger of a revolution in Germany, which they feared would spread into the Soviet Union and destroy the usurper's power, made every effort to paralyze the German toilers. Their fear was obvious to the bourgeois correspondents in Moscow. Duranty, under the cover of phrases attributing to the counter-revolutionary Stalin a desire to "build Socialism," wrote in plain words about Stalin's fear of revolution:

"In Moscow, writes Mr. Duranty, there is one menace which is feared above all others, and it is the out-

break of a revolution in Germany or elsewhere in Europe. This is a far cry from the time when Lenin staged the Bolshevik revolution in Russia, not because he was interested in Russia but because he wished to set Western Europe on fire. Today Stalin does not want to set anything on fire. He wants to be let alone to build Socialism in Russia. He is afraid of revolution abroad, even if it comes without Soviet aid." (The New York Times, Editorial, November 23, 1932. My emphasis-A.R.)

Trotsky's program, on the other hand, deceived the workers into expecting aid against fascism from the Stalin-dominated Soviet Union:

"In their struggle against Fascism the German workers will naturally seek support in the Soviet Union, AND THEY WILL FIND IT." (L. Trotsky, The Militant, July 16, 1932, p. 2. My capitals - A. B.)

When the Nazis took power, the kind of "aid" the German workers got from the Soviet Union was shown by the fact that the leaders of the Soviet Union maintained a dead silence in the vital and strategic days after January 30, 1933. In fact, as Duranty reported, the Soviet press actually avoided the subject of the Hitler Government: "It is significant that not a single word of comment on the Hitler cabinet has appeared in the Soviet Press." (The New York Times, February 2, 1933) The sub-headline over this dispatch read: "Soviet is silent on Hitler government but seems not to view it as an entire evil."

This was the "support" which the German workers received from the Stalin-controlled Soviet Union!

THE PROGRAM TODAY

WHEN Hitler came to power, and the criminality of the Stalinists became apparent to many anti-Stalinist workers the tendency toward creating a new party could no longer be restrained. In the Fall of 1933 Trotsky issued a call for a Fourth International. Thus, the program of "re-

forming" the Stalinist gangsters was self-evidently not confirmed but refuted. Therefore, when the Trotsky leaders say in the February 2, 1944 issue of The Militant that Trotsky's program in Germany "holds in full force today" they are deliberately lying and distorting both their own line today and Trotsky's pre-Hitler line. While on one hand, the Trotsky leaders say their program of 1933 is still correct today, on the other, there stands the fact that they have officially dropped the line of "correcting" the Stalinist party and repudiating a Fourth International.

A key point of Trotsky's program was his proposal of a united front between Social Democracy and Stalinism. Only through the agency of such a united front, argued Trotsky, could the German workers be enabled to prevent the victory of fascism. In actuality the imperialist Social Democracy is irrevocably tied to the German bourgeois state of which fascism is one form. With its espousal of chauvinism in 1914 and support of the world imperialist war it broke forever with the interests of the proletariat. After the imperialist war Social Democracy saved German and world capitalism from collapse by assuming power in the bourgeois state and heading the movement of the revolutionary proletariat. Its politics led inescapably to the victory of fascism.

The Stalinist bureaucracy, to safeguard its privileges and power usurped from the Soviet masses, had to prevent the development of the international proletariat towards revolution which would lead unavoidably to the overthrow not only of imperialism but of all forms of oppression includ-

FREE Back Copies

SPAIN

A comprehensive exposure of the reactionary policies of the pseudo-Leninist organizations, the Stalinists and Trotskyists, and their work in aiding to betray the toilers.

ing Stalinist bureaucratism. A united front between the counter-revolutionary Stalinist leaders and the treacherous imperialist hirelings of Social Democracy could not possibly prevent the victory of fascism. History records the formation of such united fronts as the Stalinist-Social Democratic coalition governments in Saxony and Thuringia formed in October 1933 in Germany which broke the back of the German revolution. A united front between Stalinism and Social Democracy was formed in France and Spain in 1936. The result was disruption of proletarian revolution and the victory of bourgeois reaction. The unity between counter-revolutionary forces can be based only on a counter-revolutionary program. This was the case with every single united front formed by Stalinism and Social Democracy. Yet the Trotsky leaders picture Trotsky's line for the united front between counter-revolutionary Stalinism and counter-revolutionary Social Democracy in Germany as a true road to victory over Hitler. And what is more they declare that program holds with full force today.

A characteristic of opportunist politics is the brazenness with which a counter-revolutionary policy is palmed off as correct and in the interests of the workers. When opportunists issue a prediction which is refuted by events, their line is not to re-examine the misleading predictions and point out wherein and why history refuted them, but to cover them and even to proclaim them confirmed.

A. Burke

"BREAKING ALL TIES" WITH STALINISM

WHEN in 1938 the Trotsky leadership proclaimed the founding of the "Fourth International," the Cannon-Shachtman group devoted a special issue of their paper to that occasion, reviewing the history of the rise of the Trotsky movement and of its American section. About the latter's development it was stated:

"On October 27, 1928 we raised the banner of the Russian Opposition (the Bolshevik-Leninists) in the Central Committee of the Communist Party. Therewith we broke all ties with Stalinism and we never once looked back." (Socialist Appeal, October 22, 1938)

This representation of Trotskyite politics as, presumably, divorced and distinct from the politics of Stalin's Comintern has been accepted by the uninformed workers.

A penetrating study of the whole range of Trotskyite politics throws a piercing light upon the words we have cited, revealing them as a brazen falsification. We can begin our investigation with the very issue of the paper in which the above-cited words are printed. On page 2 something is said of how the Trotsky leaders actually stood in relation to the Stalinist party after they had been expelled by Lovestone:

"But, as evidence, too, of our continuing close ties to the official Communist Party, we began the publication in The Militant of the thesis of the former Minority (Cannon-Foster bloc) in the Communist Party, entitled 'The Crisis in the Communist Party of the United States,' directed against the Lovestone-Wolfe majority."

Indeed, the printing by The Militant of the thesis of the Cannon-Foster bloc is excellent evidence of the

fact that the Cannon-Shachtman group was established from the start as a political branch of the Stalinist system. The Fosterite thesis was a factional bid to the Stalin bureaucrats at the Sixth Congress of the Comintern in the Summer of 1928 to oust Lovestone and install the Foster-Cannon bloc in power. The crux of the document was the accusation that Lovestone did not carry out the Stalinist line as laid down by the bureaucrats in Moscow. Aware of the fact that leaderships in the various sections of the Comintern were selected not by the rank-and-file but by the high moguls in the Kremlin to serve the needs of the Soviet bureaucracy, the Foster-Cannon Minority in the American Party submitted a request to Stalin for the "reorganization of the Party leadership." What Foster and Cannon alleged to be Lovestone's deviation from the Stalinist line was termed by them opportunism, and the basis for the organizational change they proposed was to be a strict adherence to the policy handed down by the Comintern:

"The opportunist line must be corrected and the basis laid down for the reorganization of the Party leadership in such a way as to insure the carrying out of the line of the Comintern." (The Militant, January 15, 1929. Our emphasis—THE BULLETIN)

When Stalin decided that Lovestone should remain in power for the time being, the Cannon group, seeing no prospect of shaking Lovestone's grip on the helm, hitched its wagon to Trotsky's star and used the above-Trotsky's star and used the above-cited purely pro-Stalinist document to attack their successful rival. Week after week, installments of this inner-Comintern, factional document appeared in the Trotskyite paper, with the declaration that the leaders of the new Trotsky group stood on its basic premise. The mind of the readers was en-

broiled in the "theoretical" controversy between the bureaucratic gangs of the Stalinist Party. The underlying essence of the whole fight was the effort on the part of the Lovestone and Foster-Cannon cliques to prove to the Soviet bureaucracy their particular fitness to carry out the policy of the Comintern. That was how Cannon-Shachtman "broke all ties with Stalinism" and "never once looked back!"

Systematic examination of Trotskyite policies reveals that beneath the thunderous phrases of "criticism," Cannon and Shachtman were firmly attached to the political essence of the Stalinist Party. This connection with the Stalin party was expressed in various ways. They tenderly called the Stalin Party, ruled by the charlatan Lovestone and his crew of political bandits, "our party." Knowing full well that the Stalinist Party was diseased with bureaucratism and corruption, that it peddled Stalin's demagogic "program" of Socialism in one country, they worked for Stalin and Lovestone by lying to the workers that "our party" would carry out its revolutionary tasks. Thus they concealed the truth that the Lovestone-directed Party was Stalin's tool of selling the workers to the bourgeoisie:

"The fundamental HEALTHINESS of OUR party, its proletarian composition, its BASIC PROGRAM are a GUARANTEE that despite the difficulties, the errors, and the shortcomings it will win the masses and fulfill ITS REVOLUTIONARY MISSION." (The Militant, December 1, 1928. Our capitals—THE BULLETIN)

This powerful Stalinist poison which aided the Comintern to snare the workers, adequately reveals the deceptive nature of the statement "There-with we broke all ties with Stalinism and we never once looked back."

The continuity of political ties with Stalinism was kept up by Cannon and Shachtman in the period of the Comintern sell-out of the German masses to Hitler. The usual cover for that political attachment to the Stalin machine of counter-revolution was a

stream of blatant phrases of "criticism." Political ties with Stalinism were maintained through the "critical" adherence to the Stalinist noose "democracy versus Fascism" with which the Comintern ensured the victory of Franco and the massacre of millions of Spanish workers. Ties with Stalinism were kept up by Cannon and Shachtman when they gave "critical" support to open and concealed Stalinist candidates in various elections. Not so long ago the Cannon leadership supported the Stalinist stooge Connolly and the Browder-controlled section of the A.L.P. That support was approved by Shachtman "in principle." When many honest workers expressed disgust at the Trotskyite aid to Stalinist politics, the Trotsky leadership took note of this healthy reaction:

"Many well-meaning people are horrified at the idea that we are supporting a Stalinist-controlled party." ("Why We Supported the A.L.P.," The Militant, March 15 1941)

Of course, every maneuver of supporting Stalinism is covered up with some excuses. For instance, in the same article the Trotsky leaders argued:

"But we must not forget that this Stalinist-controlled party is backed by Stalinist-controlled unions." (Ibid.)

The Trotsky leadership even took the occasion to set the minds of their misled followers for further support of the counter-revolutionary bandits who operate under the guise of "Communism":

"We can even whisper to our critics that if we deemed it advisable and of benefit to our party and consequently to the working class we would not hesitate to give critical support to Browder running on the Communist party ticket." (Ibid.)

This is how the Trotsky leaders "cut" all ties which connect them to the Stalinist political system of black treachery and bestial betrayal of the toiling masses.

[In the section called, "From the Arsenal of Marxism," the Fourth International of November 1941 reprints a speech by Cannon "delivered at the Party Conference of Coal Miners at St. Louis, Mo., July 27, 1924. First published in the Daily Worker, August 2, 1924." In view of the fact that at a certain stage of its existence the Third International with all Parties became Stalinist institutions of opportunism, the questions arise: Could a speech delivered by a leading Party functionary in 1924 be a weapon "From the Arsenal of Marxism"? Was the Party a Marxist Party and the Comintern to which it was affiliated, a Marxist International? What was the situation in 1924 in the American Party and the Comintern in general? What kind of a leadership and political line did these organizations have? Above all, what does Cannon know today about that past situation?

Cannon knows that already in 1924 the American "Party" was a bureaucratically degenerated body attached to a bureaucratically degenerated "Comintern." The chief source of this corruption - destined to become known in history as Stalinism - was the Russian Party, more specifically, its top leadership, the Central Committee. Dates are essential, since they represent historical landmarks. We have Trotsky's testimony as to the date when the Stalin clique came into control not only of the Central Committee, but of the country as a whole:-

"They became, Zinoviev and Kamen-
ev - with Stalin they created the
so-called 'Troika', or Triumvirate,
which was the directing body of the
Central Committee and of the
country during the period from the
end of 1922 to 1925." (The Case of
Leon Trotsky, p. 77. My emphasis - J.C.H.)

Cannon is well acquainted with the above statement by Trotsky. Note that Cannon today is conscious of the fact that when he spoke at a coal miners' conference in July 1924 the Stalin gang had already undergone a year and a half of bureaucratic entrenchment in the dominating section of the Comintern.

Furthermore, Cannon knows today that from the end of 1923 the entire Comintern leadership was handpicked by Stalin and Company on the basis of willingness to enter the faction right against Trotsky. The latter, in his autobiography, wrote:-

"On the other hand, the morally unstable elements who were being mercilessly driven out of the party during the first five years, now squared themselves by a single hostile remark against Trotsky. From the end of 1923, the same work was carried on in all the parties of the Communist International; certain leaders were dethroned and others appointed solely on the basis of their attitude toward Trotsky." (My Life, p. 501. My emphasis - J.C.H.)

Observe that Trotsky states this process of Stalinist selection of leaders occurred "in ALL the parties of the Communist International." Indeed, this is absolutely true. A lick at the Stalinist boot and a kick at Trotsky was the essential prerequisite for a top post in any of the "Comintern" Parties from about 1923 on. Cannon is not oblivious of the fact that the definitive Stalinization of the "Comintern" leadership also considerably antedated his speech of July 1924.

In December 1923, i.e., precisely at the time when, as Trotsky indicated,

the selection of the leaders in all the sections of the Comintern was a Stalin selection, the Foster-Cannon section in the American Party won the majority in the Imperialist reported:-

"The third convention of the Party (Communist) took place on December 29, 1923, and was one of the most important in the history of the Communist movement of the United States. The general policies carried out by the Central Executive Committee of the Party were approved, nevertheless the former minority of the Committee, led by Foster and Cannon, representing the 'industrialists' in the Party, carried the convention against the 'politicals,' led by Pepper and Ruthenberg, and now direct the Party." (Inprecorr, Feb. 28, 1924, p. 121. My emphasis - J.C.H.)

In 1924, as Cannon well knows, Foster made a fast dash to Moscow, sized up the factional situation, and declared in favor of the "Old Guard" in the Russian "Party," i.e., the Stalin-Zinoviev-Kamenev gang of usurpers. He could not do otherwise if he wanted to remain in the leadership. The Foster-Cannon leadership received the approval of the Stalingang at the head of the Comintern. It was as a leader of such a faction that Cannon delivered in 1924 a speech which today he tells the workers is a weapon "From the Arsenal of Marxism."

After his expulsion from the "Party," for forming a Trotsky group in 1928 Cannon on an occasion declared that the faction fight which raged in the "Party" since 1923 had been a product of the Stalinization of the Party and that, quoting a contemptuous phrase which Stalin's "ECCI" had the cynicism to spit frequently in the face of all the factions, it "had no basis in principle":-

"The Party is in the throes of a factional crisis which has raged continuously since 1923. This factional struggle, which the E.C.C.I. frequently declared 'has no basis in principle,' is the product of the Stalinization of the Party and

the imposition upon it from above of an artificial and incompetent leadership." (The Militant, Feb. 17, 1929, p. 7.)

Thus, not only in 1941, when he reprinted a 1924 speech as being "From the Arsenal of Marxism," but even so far back as 1929, Cannon was already fully conscious that since 1923 the course of the American "Party" was marked by Stalinization, an uncanceled clique fight for power.

After Cannon was expelled from the "Party," he issued from time to time biographical sketches of the various "Party" leaders, among them his former faction-mates. Concerning Foster, the "Party" leader of 1924 and for years his co-worker in the "Party," Cannon wrote in 1929:-

"His methods were marked by an ingrained and incurable dishonesty. His inability to put any question squarely, his systematic muddling and misrepresentation of issues and his subordination of the task of educating the Party to the immediate aim of securing votes in a faction struggle had a sad effect on the workers around him. Their political development was arrested in its most elementary stages, and what became finally crystallized as the Foster faction was always a picture of political impotence." (The Militant, Aug. 15, 1929, p. 3. My emphasis - J.C.H.)

Such was the sordid character of the leadership of the American Stalinist Party in 1924 - as at all times before and after regardless of what specific clique of swindlers was in control. Cannon today is well aware of this matter and has been for many years.

It is now time to say something about the line of Cannon's 1924 speech which the Trotskyite leaders today tell the workers is "From the Arsenal of Marxism." An examination reveals that speech to be wholly from the arsenal of Stalinism. Here is how that speech characterized the American Stalinist Party in 1924:-

"Our Party is a party of the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat." ("From the Arsenal of Marxism," Fourth International, November 1941, p. 285.)

It is indisputable that today, when the Trotskyite leaders reprint this speech, they know these remarks were falsifications from the arsenal of Stalinism. Today they know that the "Party" of 1924 was not a Party of proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, but was a "Party" of Stalinist corruption.

The "Party," having already condemned "Trotskyism," was rapidly becoming a factional instrument in the hands of the Soviet and Comintern bureaucracy, standing for the preservation of Stalin's leadership in the Soviet Union. But in Cannon's speech the workers were taught something quite different; the "Party" was -

".....the only Party standing for the solution of the labor problem by means of the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism." (Ibid.)

And, in a final sweeping sentence, the opportunist outfit led by a man whose "methods were marked by an ingrained and incurable dishonesty," secretly guided by the Usurper in the Kremlin

"WE NEVER PROMISED"

FOR many years Trotsky's line was "reform" of the Stalinized Comintern. Although the Comintern was daily adding new crimes to the vast volume of its treachery and betrayal, Trotsky was adamant in pursuing the policy of "correcting" that international machine of Stalinist counter-

whom Lenin stigmatized as disloyal, was pictured as the engine of the future proletarian revolution:

"We will win over the masses to the side of Communism; we will wrest the labor movement from the hands of the agents of the bourgeoisie and convert them into mighty instruments for the proletarian revolution." (Ibid.)

Cannon and his aides, the Morrums and Wrights, knew that his 1924 speech was a cover for the Stalinization of the Party. Yet Cannon is not above palming off a Stalinist document as being "From the Arsenal of Marxism." This happens to suit the needs of his career, of his total pretense of being a Marxist leader of the proletariat, and so he brazenly indulges in such antics. Cannon is an old-time careerist whose political life has consisted of prowling about the labor movement seeking a base of operations now with Stalin's approval as his trade mark, now with Trotsky's. It is the great tragedy of the present-day proletariat that these fraudulent trade marks still have an attractive force, and it is only when the advanced workers learn to repudiate these shams that they will be able to forge a genuine revolutionary Party and International.

J. C. Hunter
June 28, 1942

revolution. From 1929 to 1933 the fate of the toilers of all countries hinged upon the destiny of the German proletariat whose vanguard was paralyzed primarily by Stalinism. During those years Trotsky faced mounting criticism from many of his former supporters who rejected the line of "reforming" the

3
Comintern. The utopian character of Trotsky's policy had a cumulative aspect. When the Comintern delivered German workers to Hitler its vicious nature became revealed to the advanced workers more vividly than ever before. Under the impact of the Stalinist betrayal in Germany, Trotsky's line of "reforming" the Comintern collapsed. Trotsky was compelled to abandon it, and in the process felt constrained to lash out against his "left" critics who had for a number of years attempted to convince the workers that the Comintern was incurable. Trotsky declared:

"During the last few years -- appropriately enough -- our opponents have told us more than once that we are losing time in vain' by occupying ourselves with curing the Comintern. We never promised anybody that we would cure the Comintern. We only refused, until the decisive test, to pronounce the sick as dead, or hopelessly ill." (The Soviet Union and the Fourth International, pp. 8-9)

The work containing the statement that the Trotsky leadership never promised to cure the Comintern was widely distributed by the Cannon-Shachtman organization. To the honest Trotskyite followers, who never suspected that virtually every excuse Trotsky offered for his policies never squared with actual facts, Trotsky's statement appeared as truth. Had they gone to the trouble of examining Trotsky's earlier writings, they would have realized the actual worth of his words "We never promised anybody that we would cure the Comintern." For illustration, had they perused the pages of The Militant for October 21, 1933, they would have come upon the following statement:

"The slogan of the 'reform' of the Comintern was, for us, never a hollow phrase. We counted on reform as on a reality."

And if they had continued their investigation they would have found direct promises of a turn of the Stalinist organization in a revolutionary direction. About a year before the Nazis took power, the Cannon-Shachtman leaders wrote reassuringly about the German Stalinist Party:

"The German party is still capable of victory, of uniting the proletariat about it -- for the defeat of the class enemy. Victory can come, will come in the way of the Left Opposition and comrade Trotsky, in the way of Lenin." (The Militant, January 23, 1932. My emphasis-G. M.)

In his pamphlet Germany - What Next? Trotsky wrote in a positive vein: "The about-face of the Stalinists is INEVITABLE" (p. 182. My capitals - G.M.). And in his work The Strategy of the World Revolution Trotsky asserted in tones that brooked no contradiction:

"...the Opposition needs no other soil than that of the Communist International. No one will succeed in tearing us away from it. Our ideas will become its ideas and they will find their expression in the program of the Comintern." (p. 86. Emphasis in the original.)

It is not difficult to penetrate Trotsky's lie "We never promised anybody that we would cure the Comintern." In the face of his critics, who may not have known anything about Trotsky's secret alliance with Stalin in the early days of the Stalinist conspiracy but certainly grasped that the Comintern had become corroded with treachery, Trotsky slid out of the old line by resorting to a barefaced lie to save his prestige among the uninformed honest Trotskyite workers.

G.M.

THE OPPORTUNISM OF BROWDER AND FOSTER IS AN OLD STORY.
It began long before "Teheran."

Read the evidence on how these bureaucrats helped betray
the German workers to Hitler in 1933 through ultra-left-
ist tactics.

Read the evidence of Browder and Foster's participation
in the sell-out of the Spanish toilers to Franco through
ultra-rightist maneuvers during the Spanish Civil War.

The reactionary forces which gave rise to the Browders
and Fosters of the Stalinized "Comintern" stand exposed
in —

EARL BROWDER COMMUNIST OR TOOL OF WALL STREET?

(STALIN, TROTSKY OR LENIN)

- by -

GEORGE MARLEN

493 pages
Price: \$1.00

Address:-

THE RED STAR PRESS
P.O. Box 67
Station D.,
New York

54

THE TROTSKY SCHOOL OF FALSIFICATION

THE FUSION WITH THE MUSTEITES

A REVEALING EPISODE

RECENTLY the Trotsky leadership has been going to great lengths into the history of their movement. Many articles and some books have been published on this theme. The announced purpose of this campaign is to instruct the Trotskyite workers in the "Marxist" character and "principled" line of its leadership. Amongst other things, the Trotsky leaders have referred to the various blocs and combinations which they made with other tendencies. Certain interesting features in those fusions, throwing a revealing light on the nature of the Trotsky leadership, have been invariably left out by the Trotskyite historians. This column has been systematically supplying these features. In the present instance we take up an aspect of the Trotskyist fusion with Muste.

In 1928 a former preacher, A. J. Muste, formed a group under a "progressive" coloration designed to hook those trade union workers who were repelled by the more open agents of the bosses. Backed by a few wealthy "angels," Muste quickly won some adherents, and published a paper, Labor Age.

The very first manifesto of the Muste group met with a sharp condemnation from the Trotskyite Communist League of America. The function of the Muste group was correctly described as follows:

"The recent manifesto of the pseudo-progressive group of the 'Labor Age' is primarily a reflection of this discontent in the ranks of the unions which the reformists seek to divert into harmless channels. The appearance of the new movement, even in a nebulous form, with pseudo-progressives at its head, is a sign of the abdication of the Communist and the Left Wing who in recent years have led these unions. It is a warning that continued neglect of the struggle in the old unions clears the road for the reformist stultification of potentially revolutionary movements within them." (The Militant, February 15, 1929, p. 5. My emphasis - A. B.)

The Muste group developed and took the form of a "Conference for Progressive Labor Action." The role of the Musteites in the trade union movement, that of "left" apologists for the AFL bureaucracy, was shown clearly in the field of the textile and mine workers where the Muste group had some forces and exercised a measure of influence. Their essential function in the union movement was characterized by the Trotsky leaders with scientific precision:

"The C. P. L. A. people are playing the role of come-ons for the labor fakers." (The Militant, January 25, 1930)

Muste's C. P. L. A. talked about eschewing politics in the trade union movement. However, the Trotsky leaders were not fooled by the "a political" professions of the Musteites and classified them as an undeclared wing of the Social Democracy:

"The social-democracy — from its extreme Right wing in the A. F. of L. bureaucracy to its extreme left wing in the Muste group — is the staunchest bulwark of bourgeois democracy against the proletarian revolutionary movement." (The Militant, July 25, 1931, p. 4)

In July-August 1931 Muste's group dropped its "non-partisan" political disguise and openly proclaimed itself as a distinct political organization. The only change, according to the Trotsky leaders, was that Muste and his followers were now openly transferring their treacherous union role onto the political field. Likewise in classifying the membership of Muste's organization, Cannon-Shachtman failed to discern the presence of any revolutionists:

"The organization consists of intellectuals, pacifists, S.P. members and leaders who themselves need leadership." (The Militant, May 27, 1933, p. 2)

And finally, as late as June 1933 the Trotsky leaders prophesied the collapse of Muste's outfit, dubbed its leaders fake militants and characterized the C. P. L. A. as a sterile exponent of reformism:

"It is plain, therefore, that the collapse of Musteism is inevitable. With the revolutionary upsurge of the American working class these fake 'militants' of the CPLA will stand exposed as barren and futile evangelists of reformism." (The Militant, June 1933, p. 2)

The line of the Cannon-Shachtman leadership on the Muste outfit was thus clear. From the beginning they classified Muste as a "left" labor faker whose function was to cover up the betrayals of the A. F. L. bureaucracy with a sugar coating of radical phrases. When the C. P. L. A. decided to dispense with its a political cloak and definitely announced its formation into a distinctly political grouping, the Trotsky leaders stuck to their analysis of this tendency as "evangelists of reformism."

About six months later Cannon and Shachtman suddenly announced that negotiations were taking place with Muste for fusion. The true estimate of Muste as being a "left" labor faker and the characterization of his group as reformist disappeared from the Trotsky press. For some time the negotiations stalled but with Trotsky's July 1934 letter introducing the French Turn an impetus was given to the negotiations with Muste. By the time fusion was accomplished in December 1934, Cannon and Shachtman had already made a complete about-face on the character of the Muste group. In describing the vote at the Muste convention for fusion The Militant went into raptures about the past role of Muste's C.P.L.A. and gave it a clean bill of health:

36

"This was the last and most important act in the career of an organization that within the few years of its existence initiated and led some of the most significant and militant struggles of the American proletariat, blazed the trail in the trade unions of honest, militant, left-wing leadership, built the greatest of existing unemployed organizations and won for itself an impressive niche in the history of the working class march to power in America." (The Militant, December 8, 1934)

Before fusion with Muste and his followers was in the perspective of the Cannon leadership, The Militant wrote in quite a different vein about the role of the Muste group in the unions. Here is a typical sample:

"As soon as the working class showed signs of moving away from the bourgeoisie, and even from reformism, the Musteites came forward as a barrier in the path of the workers' advance seeking to turn them back to reformism by devious routes, but under no conditions to allow them to take the natural road of development towards Communism. Since its organization, this has been the primary function of the C. P. L. A. Developed on the trade union field as a political bloc of yellow socialists, labor bureaucrats, pseudo-progressives, and finally embracing turncoats from Communism like Miller and Benjamin and even further 'left' -- the Lovestoneite group itself -- the C. P. L. A. now seeks to transfer its functions more directly into the political field." (August 8, 1931, p. 1)

Such was the character of the Muste group which for reasons of factional unity was now advertised as having "blazed the trail in the trade unions of honest, militant, left-wing leadership" and consequently won for itself "an impressive niche" in the labor movement!

One may imagine that the "re-evaluation" of and fusion with Muste was prompted by his repudiation of his rotten past -- "come on for the labor fakers." However, this is not the basis on which the Trotsky leaders form and conclude combinations. Well aware of this fact, Muste frankly stated:

"We are not repudiating our pasts, rather we are looking towards the future," A. J. Muste said in opening the session." (The Militant, December 8, 1934. My emphasis--A. B.)

When Lovestone in 1931 began a flirtation with the Musteites he followed the same dishonest pattern described above and it is amusing to read the indignant reprimands which Shachtman addressed to Lovestone for the opportunist shift in analysis on the Muste group:

"We established our point of view on the progressive movement and its leaders from the very beginning and

have had no reason to change it to suit factional expediency, which was done, however, as has now become clear as day by the Lovestone group." (The Militant, January 1, 1931, p. 3)

Obviously, the readers of the above got the impression that the Trotsky leaders were of an entirely different character from the putrid Lovestone gang.

One can take Shachtman's estimate of the crooked Lovestone tactics in regard to the Muste group when a bloc was in Lovestone's mind, and apply it verbatim to the methods which the Trotsky leaders used in 1934:

"Little by little, therefore, the tone of criticism of the Muste group is moderated, thinned down to a whisper. Yesterday's social reformists and weak-kneed pseudo-progressives become today 'militants' and 'genuine progressives'; tomorrow they will be irreproachable comrades-in-arms." (Ibid.)

Just as with Lovestone, it is factional expediency which is the guiding line of the Cannon and Shachtman leadership. When they decided to join forces with the "left" labor faker, Muste, all the theses and resolutions which they had written concerning the reactionary nature of the Muste group were unceremoniously buried without so much as a word of repudiation. To make the fusion palatable to their deceived followers, the Trotsky leaders completely whitewashed Muste's past and spread outright lies that his past was in the interest of the working class.

For fifteen long years Muste was a pseudo-progressive, a fake militant, as the Trotsky leaders themselves agreed. He flirted now with the Socialist bureaucrats, now the Comintern, now with Lovestone. This unbroken fifteen year history of deceiving the workers was dishonestly pictured by the Trotsky leaders as serving the interests of the proletariat:

"On Wednesday, January 9, a testimonial dinner will be given for A. J. Muste, National Secretary of the Workers Party, at Irving Plaza, New York City. The dinner is to commemorate his fiftieth birthday, and the fifteenth year of his invaluable service in the revolutionary labor movement." (The Militant, December 29, 1934)

The followers of Cannon and Shachtman, of course, may feel pressed to defend the maneuvers with Muste. It may be argued: The Trotskyite leaders were not interested so much in Muste, but in winning the rank-and-file of the Musteite workers to a Marxist position. If fusion with Muste could accomplish this, then it was justifiable.

On the surface this sounds logical. But, if Cannon's and Shachtman's interest was in clarifying Muste's followers and winning them to a Marxist position, why did these leaders whitewash Muste's rotten past? Did the lies Cannon and Shachtman spread about Muste's past clarify the rank-and-file? The Can-

nonite and Shachtmanite followers may argue further that Muste signed a Marxist program when he fused with the Trotskyites. We will not debate at this point how "Marxist" that program was. Let us grant for the sake of argument that Muste signed a Marxist program. The rank-and-file, however, is not clarified by the mere signing. Only by an understanding of the rotten nature of Muste's political history could the rank-and-file Musteites really break with their opportunist background. Cannon-Shachtman's whitewash of Muste's record blocked the path of a real enlightenment of the Musteite following. The Musteite followers united with the Trotskyite outfit taking with them the whole political garbage of Musteism.

From every angle it becomes clear that the fusion with Muste was a maneuver at the top between the leaderships of two opportunist organizations. "You scratch my back, I'll scratch yours" — this was the essence of the political basis of the fusion. If Cannon and Shachtman were really interested in clarifying the Musteite rank-and-file and winning them to Marxism, they would have had no reason to whitewash Muste. Their covering up of this small-time labor faker reveals the essence of this shabby maneuver.

It is by such tactics that Cannon-Shachtman build the Trotskyite movement. The result for the followers of Cannon and Shachtman has been to become entangled with one political swindler after another. Through deals such as these, Cannon and Shachtman have kept their followers from the Marxist path and have helped to perpetuate the huge structure of opportunism in the working class.

The truly Marxist method of building a proletarian party is to break decisively and permanently with every brand of opportunist swindler.

A. Burke
May 4, 1945

A Compilation of articles appearing in THE BULLETIN

The Trotsky School PART I of Falsification

WHAT TROTSKY TAUGHT ABOUT HITLERISM
SOME LIGHT ON A CROOKED DEAL
AN ALIBI AND WHAT IT CONCEALS

SEND FOR FREE COPIES

P.O.B. 67 - Station D
New York City

POLITICAL JUGGLERY

When in 1933 the Trotskyites first came out for a Fourth International, many of the most advanced radical workers heaved a sigh of relief. These workers felt that finally a wonderful opportunity had arisen to free themselves of entanglements with Stalinism and Social Democracy. They believed that an instrument was about to be forged for a clear-cut struggle against the whole rotten structure of opportunism personified by the Second and Third Internationals. The idea of being a "faction of the Comintern" had become repulsive to these workers. Needless to say, insofar as the Second International was concerned Lenin's ringing phrase "Never again along the lines of the Second International" was indelibly impressed upon their consciousness. If these advanced workers considered themselves finished with the Third International, not even in their wildest nightmares could they picture themselves ever a part of the Second International.

The impossibility of reforming or renewing the Second International was proclaimed by the Trotskyites time and again:

"Is it possible to reform or renew the Second International, pervaded by crimes and treacheries? The war and all past war events answer: 'No!'" (The Militant, March 31, 1934, p. 1)

However, less than four months after the above declaration, Trotsky in a letter dated July 24, 1934 suddenly proposed that the French Trotskyites enter the S.F.I.O. (Socialist Party of France). Proposals for entry into the parties of the Second International were soon extended into one country after another.

In the United States the Trotskyite leaders, Cannon and Shachtman, gave wholehearted support to Trotsky's new line, which was eventually to bring the American Trotskyite group

into the Socialist Party. However, the presence of a large and vociferous opposition (Oehlerites) called for some maneuvering on the part of Cannon and Shachtman. To allay any suspicion, they vigorously and periodically proclaimed the impossibility of reforming the Second International:

"The Second and the Third International are outlived and have become obstacles on the revolutionary road. It is impossible to 'reform' them, because the whole composition of their leadership is radically hostile to the tasks and the methods of the proletarian revolution." (New Militant, Sept. 7, 1935, p. 3)

Rumors that they intended to enter the American Socialist party were of course persistently and scathingly denounced by Cannon and Shachtman:

"The June Plenum of the National Committee of the W.P. took note of rumors to the effect that there are leaders and members of the W.P. who advocate that the W.P. should join or merge with the Socialist Party. Occasionally it is necessary to take account of rumor and gossip, no matter how absurd and irresponsible it may be simply because it is so persistent. Solely on this ground, the Plenum hereby states that all such reports are absolutely without foundation, that no leaders or members of the W.P. advocate or have advocated any such program." (New Militant, July 6, 1935, p. 2. Emphasis in original.)

Only several weeks before the Trotskyite leaders actually took their Workers Party into the American Socialist Party, their press was still writing reassuring words about the necessity to break sharply with Social Democracy:

"It is necessary not merely to understand that social-democratic reformism is bankrupt; but posi-

tively to break sharply from Social Democracy; and this sharp break can be decisively accomplished only by embracing and adhering firmly to the principles of revolutionary Marxism." (New Militant, April 18, 1936, p. 1)

One can readily see the insincerity and unprincipledness of these leaders in their declarations about the necessity for breaking sharply from the social democracy, and of the impossibility of reforming the parties of the Second International. The unprincipledness of the Trotskyite leaders becomes even more glaringly apparent when one reads that they proposed not only to enter into the Socialist Party but promised to build the S.P. into a revolutionary organization:

"On the basis of equal duties and equal rights we obligate ourselves to work loyally and devotedly to build the Socialist Party into a powerful, united organization in the revolutionary struggle for socialism." (Statement of the National Committee, New Militant, June 6, 1936)

To satisfy the revolutionary sentiments of their honest followers, however, Cannon and Shachtman had to advance some plausible explanation for their reversal and the decision to enter the Socialist Party. These adroit political acrobats suddenly "discovered" that the Detroit Convention of the Socialist Party, held in May-June 1934, marked a decisive turning point in the history of the movement. This convention, asserted the Trotskyite leaders, had made a sharp break with the classic reformism of post-war Social Democracy and had given evidence of a determination not to repeat the crimes of their political brothers in Germany and Austria which led to the victory of fascism:

"The Detroit Convention of the Socialist Party in 1934 marked a decisive turning point in the history of the movement. The declaration of Principles then adopted, despite the ambiguity and confusion of its principles, made a sharp break with the classical reformism

of the post-war Social Democracy, and gave evidence of a determination not to repeat the terrible mistakes and crimes of the parties which has led the Austrian and German masses to the yoke of fascism." ("Workers Party Calls All Revolutionary Workers to Join the Socialist Party," New Militant, June 6, 1936, p. 1)

Let us therefore turn to what the Trotskyite leaders previously said about this Detroit Convention of the Socialist Party in 1934.

The New International, then the theoretical organ of the Trotskyites, carried an article in its November 1934 issue signed M.S., analyzing this very Convention. This analysis exposed this S.P. Convention as a miserable affair at which the "Militant" leaders (Norman Thomas et al.) gave every indication of a readiness to capitulate to the Old Guard Socialists:

"The results do show, however, that in the principal centers the Right Wing bureaucracy and its petty-bourgeois adherents are far stronger than many would like to believe. Nor was its strength properly challenged in view of the fact that the Militants at all times pursued a pusillanimous course where a bold one was required, opposed a policy of confusion to the clear cut Right Wing policy of its opponents, and gave every indication of its readiness to capitulate under vigorous pressure." ("What Next in the Socialist Party," p. 99)

Furthermore, this Trotskyite writer stated that the Detroit Declaration not only did not merit the term revolutionary but was not even meant seriously:

"Neither the document nor its advocates merit the adjective 'revolutionary.' But timid and muddled as it is, it might be imagined that it is meant seriously. Far from it. The very first act of the new leadership of the party, following the announcement of its victory, was to rush into print

with an abject exhortation to the Right Wingers to remain inside the party with full rights to propagate their anti-socialist doctrines." (Ibid.)

However, in 1936 this analysis was conveniently "forgotten" by the Trotskyite leaders and the S.P. Detroit Convention was suddenly and quite dishonestly palmed off as a decisive turning point in the American Socialist Party. To justify the turn toward the Socialist Party the Trotskyite leaders pictured the miserable Detroit Convention of the thoroughly opportunist Socialist Party as evidencing a break with the classical reformism of the post-war Social Democracy. The Trotskyite leaders invented evidence of "a determination not to repeat the terrible mistakes and crimes of the parties which has led the Austrian and German masses to the yoke of Fascism."

The real intent of the Detroit Declaration of the S.P. in 1934 which spun a lot of radical sounding demagoguery was to channel off the growing desire of the militant workers in the S. P. to break with the old line reformism. This was recognized by the Trotskyite leaders in 1934.

"The growing desire of the militant (without the capital M!) workers in the party for a break with bankrupt reformism, a desire enhanced by the tragic defeats in Europe, had to be satisfied before it developed to a logical and consistent conclusion. The Militant leaders, most of whom had lived in perfect ease and harmony with Waldman and Co. up to yesterday, threw these workers a sop in the form of the Detroit Declaration." (Ibid.)

This analysis of the intent of the Detroit Declaration was not restricted to M.S. in The New International. The leader of the Workers Party, J. P. Cannon, reached similar conclusions in his series of articles blasting this convention along the same lines;

"A change in front has become an imperative necessity in order to hold the organizations together and regain the confidence of the work-

ers. This is the role of Centrism. The revolutionary impulses of the workers are met with general formulations which sound extremely radical but which do not mean anything specifically. The Detroit declaration abounds in these treacherous and deceptive formulations." (The Militant, June 9, 1934, p. 3.)

However, in 1936 Cannon and Shachtman played up the deceptive and treacherous formulations of the Detroit Declaration as evidencing a determination not to repeat the crimes of the Social Democrats in Austria and Germany.

Politically advanced workers must be guided by the concrete actions of their leaders and not by abstract theoretical hocus-pocus. In maneuvering the Trotskyite rank-and-file into the S.P. Cannon and Shachtman resorted to the treacherous tactics of concealing their former position on Social Democracy and issuing fake reevaluations.

What was the real political meaning of the Trotskyite dive into the S.P.?

The French Turn period coincided generally with the swing toward the ultra-Rightist policy of Stalin's Comintern begun in 1934 and officially sanctioned at the Seventh Congress of the C.I. in July 1935. In the ultra-Rightist swing of Stalin's C.I. the Comintern bureaucrats re-evaluated the role of Social Democracy. The "third period" fraud of "social fascism" and "united fronts from below" against the socialist leaders was dropped and in its stead a line promoting the strengthening of Socialist Parties with whose leaders united fronts were to be made, was now put forward. The "French Turn" was the Trotskyite version of the Stalinist noise about "organic unity" with Social Democracy. Thus, the Trotsky line of regenerating and rebuilding the parties of the Second International black with crimes and treachery against the workers, served ingeniously to tie the Trotskyite workers to the Stalinist Rightist line.

At the present time the Trotskyite leaders in writing history say that in 1933 when they proclaimed the need for the Fourth International it implied a recognition that the Third International like the Second which preceded it had become too ossified to permit of regeneration:

"In 1933, in proclaiming the necessity for the Fourth International we, and our co-thinkers throughout the world, declared that the Comintern was dead as a revolutionary body, by which we meant that there could be no longer any hope of halting its degeneration and turning it back to its revolutionary origins. Like the Second International which preceded it, the Third International had become too ossified to permit of regeneration." (Fourth International, June 1943, p. 173. My emphasis - A. B.)

This is a patent concealment of the whole sordid history of the French Turn politics of 1934-37 with all its fake evaluations of the Socialist

Party and its fraudulent promises "to make it a party of consistent revolutionary Marxism."

The Trotsky leaders function along a certain systematic pattern. Just as they left their pre-French Turn evaluations of Social Democracy unrepudiated so they now leave unacknowledged their French Turn somersault with its "theoretical" story of the possibility of making revolutionary parties out of the hopelessly ossified Second International.

It is clear that the Trotsky "Fourth International" movement is just a snare to trap the revolutionary anti-Stalinist workers. The building of a real and genuine Fourth International means, therefore, in the first instance, a break from the treacherous leadership of the Cannons and Shachtmans, and the exposure of these unprincipled jugglers of fraudulent "theories."

Arthur Burke
October 5, 1943

Send for Free back issues
of THE BULLETIN

EXPOSING THE ROLE OF PSEUDO-BOLSHEVISM
IN THE PRESENT EPOCH

ADDRESS: P.O. BOX 67
Station D - N. Y. C.

SOVIET DIPLOMACY: LENINIST VERSUS STALINIST

FOLLOWING the founding of the Soviet State, Lenin and the Bolshevik Party established the fundamental principles governing the diplomatic relations between the Soviet Republic and the various imperialist powers. The outstanding feature of Lenin's diplomacy was the line of fostering world proletarian revolution as the real defense of the Workers State. With the ascendance of Stalinism this line was completely abandoned and buried by the bureaucratic usurpers of power. The bureaucracy sought to win "friends" among the imperialist powers. When the teachings of the revolutionary leadership grew dim in the mind of the Communist workers, the Stalinist Comintern began to spread skillfully-phrased distortions of Lenin's diplomatic policy. One of these distortions was an article written by Radek in 1932 after he had ceased being an "oppositionist" and became one of the outstanding flunkies of Stalin.

At the time Radek's article appeared a move ominous to the Soviet Union was made by the Japanese imperialists. Japan occupied Manchuria, giving her a contiguous border with Siberia. Expressing the fears of the Soviet bureaucracy, Karl Radek publicly hinted at a possible alliance between the United States and the Stalin-ruled Soviet Union directed against Japan.

The Trotskyite leaders wrote in outraged tones at such monstrous unprincipledness and accused Radek of criminal violation of Lenin's position against alliance with one imperialist power against another.

"What does exist is an unprecedented, reactionary unprincipled, 'diplomatic' proposal which spits right in the face of what Lenin wrote expressly on the question of the impermissibility for the Soviets to join hands with one imperialist power for the struggle against another." (The Militant

April 16, 1932. My emphasis-D.S.)

It was not difficult for Cannon-Shachtman to prove conclusively that the Stalinist policy, as voiced by Radek, was a reactionary departure from the principles advanced by Lenin in 1918. All they had to do was to go to the records of the pre-Stalin days and show black on white how all the Bolshevik leaders, Stalin included, stood on the matter of alliances with imperialist powers. Since Lenin had formulated the specific principle in words easy to understand, Cannon and Shachtman seized upon them with both hands, to prove Stalin's opportunism:

"Our policy must be based not on a choice between two imperialisms but on the possibility of strengthening the socialist revolution or at least on the necessity of enabling it to offer resistance until the other countries join the revolutionary movement... (omission in original) We have always fought our own imperialism, but the overthrow of the imperialism of one country by means of an alliance with the imperialism of another, is a line of action that we reject both on reasons of principle and because we consider it inadmissible." (The Militant, April 16, 1932)

The Militant pointed out that Lenin adopted this position at a time when the starving Soviet Republic had no army, no munitions, no guns with which to hold back the German imperialist forces marching into the country. Despite such a desperate situation Lenin clung tenaciously to the line of rejecting any alliances with any of the imperialists and accepted rather the rapacious Brest-Litovsk Treaty. The Militant wrote:

"Let us remember that this was written at a time when Russia's need for 'Allies' was infinitely more acute than today, at a time when there was no Red army and when

(unlike the situation in Manchuria) the German forces had already advanced upon Russian territory into the very heart of the country. In spite of this Lenin offered objections in principle to the proposals for an alliance with the Anglo-French imperialists. He did not withdraw them even when Kamkov, leader of the Social Revolutionists announced to the Soviet Congress the withdrawal of that party's support of the Bolshevik government because Lenin preferred to sign the humiliating treaty of Brest-Litovsk." (April 30, 1932)

Although the Stalinist trampling upon the principle came fourteen years after it had been enunciated by Lenin, Cannon and Shachtman made a special point of stressing the old position as inviolable. They showed thereby that they were perfectly clear that the principle was the cornerstone of a revolutionary foreign policy and could not be rejected or cancelled at any time, no matter in what difficulty the Soviet Union might find itself.

The Trotskyite leaders gave every outward appearance that they would cling tenaciously to the principled position of Lenin on the impermissibility of a workers' state making a military alliance with an imperialist country.

A FEW years after Radek so cautiously broached the subject of military alliances, the Stalin gang actually passed from the talking stage to deeds and formed a military "alliance" with the financial oligarchy of France. No longer were Trotsky and his followers faced with merely a distant hint but with a naked opportunist policy concretely applied. How did Trotsky react now? The topic came up during the hearings of the Dewey Commission. Trotsky was asked the following question:

"What is your general attitude towards making alliances for war purposes or other purposes between the Soviet Union and a capitalist country?" (The Case of Leon Trotsky, pp. 314-315)

Trotsky, who knew the Leninist principled reply to this question, replied:

"In so far as it can serve to preserve the Soviet Union an alliance becomes a necessity. It is only a question of not hindering by this alliance the workers' movement abroad. But in principle I admit it — the necessity of an alliance to preserve the Soviet Union." (Ibid. My emphasis - D.S.)

We can observe from Trotsky's answer that in place of the revolutionary principle enunciated by Lenin in 1918, Trotsky now upheld a new "principle." This newly-concocted "principle" was no other than the opportunist line of Stalin and his Comintern. It was support with "criticism," as usual!

Pseudo-Marxists always mask their betrayal of proletarian principles with revolutionary-sounding sophistry, so as to prevent the advanced workers from detecting that betrayal. The treacherous bureaucrats of the Comintern told the workers that the Stalin-Laval alliance would aid in the defense of the workers State. Strikingly enough, Trotsky fundamentally took up the same line. He gave as a reason for the permissibility in principle of military alliances the preservation of the Soviet Union. One can cite no graver time when the Soviets needed aid for the preservation of the newly formed Soviet state than 1918 when the German imperialist forces were marching toward Petrograd and the Soviets were completely destitute. Yet, as The Militant stated in April 1932, "In spite of this, Lenin offered objections in principle to the proposals for an alliance with the Anglo-French imperialists."

When revolutionists insist upon adherence to principles they do not proceed from the blind worship of abstract formulations but from the angle of defending the interests of the proletariat. It is clear why Lenin, and Trotsky when the latter was still a revolutionist, rejected the line of military alliances with imperialist powers. Such alliances would only serve to spread illusions among the

workers, since the basic interests of imperialism and the proletarian State are irreconcilable.

In 1918 the Anglo-French imperialists proposed an alliance with the Bolshevik government to continue the war against Kaiser Germany. On this line the Anglo-French rulers promised aid to the Soviet Republic. Lenin saw through the scheme and warned the workers that behind the shield of such an "alliance" the Anglo-French and the German imperialists would maneuver in common to defeat the Soviet State. Lenin rejected the proposed military alliance. On the basis of a Marxist analysis of the irreconcilable conflict between a workers State and the imperialist world, Lenin enunciated the impermissibility of a Soviet-imperialist military alliance as a basic Marxist principle.

History in a negative way proved the correctness of this old-established principle. Stalin's "military alliance" with the French imperialists deceived both the Soviet and the world masses into believing that if the Nazis had opened an attack upon the Soviet Union, France would immediately have come to its assistance. In reality the French imperialists never meant to aid the Soviet Union. Stalin's "Franco-Soviet alliance" was an added propaganda weapon in the hands of the Hitler gang to have the German masses accept the starvation conditions in order to intensify the rearming of Germany, which incidentally was foisted by Stalin's "allies," the French bankers. Not only are Stalinist "alliances" deceptions of the masses but also the Stalinist "non-aggression pacts." The best example is the Hitler-Stalin pact. It gave the Soviet masses the illusion that Hitler would not attack them. This paralyzing illusion aided in the destruction of millions of lives of the Soviet masses.

THE Trotskyite stock-in-trade is a pretense of "opposition" to Stalin which serves to conceal the underlying policy of support of Stalinism. While Trotsky supported Stalin in betrayals, he always ^(admitted) this

65
support with "criticism." Such was the case also with the violation of the Leninist principle of the impermissibility of forming military alliances with an imperialist country. In the Dewey hearings Goldman paraphrased Trotsky's reply to make certain that Trotsky's statement could in no way be misunderstood:

"In other words, in principle you admit that under certain circumstances it is necessary to make an alliance with a capitalist country."

Trotsky's answer to this was as follows:

"Under the condition that the Communist Party of the allied country is not obliged to support its Government, and that the Communist Party remains free in its opposition against the Government." (Ibid.)

This is the "criticism" which Trotsky offers as a blind for his whitewash of Stalin's opportunism. Military alliances, said Trotsky, are in principle permissible, but the Communist Party must remain free. In other words, military alliances are all right, but Stalin does not make them correctly. Let us, however, examine this "criticism" to see whether it holds water, and whether it is a bona fide condition upon which the principle of military alliances or no military alliances depends.

Trotsky states that an alliance between an imperialist power and a workers' State is acceptable in principle if "the Communist Party of the allied country is not obliged to support its Government," and "remains free in its opposition against the Government." But Trotsky knew that early in 1918 when the question of an alliance with Anglo-French imperialism against German imperialism arose there were no Communist Parties in France and England, nor was there a Communist International. Yet Lenin ruled out an alliance with imperialist countries. Therefore, the condition which Trotsky advanced for the permissibility of forming a military alliance played no part

in Lenin's principle against such an alliance. That Lenin rejected as unprincipled was a military alliance as such. Trotsky concocted his condition to cover his own violation of the Leninist principle.

* * *

THROUGHOUT the degeneration of the Soviet Union, Stalin with the aid of Trotsky's support, white-wash and "criticism" has succeeded in burying the Marxist-Leninist principles attained through the vast and costly experiences of the proletariat. That principle is only one of the many which have been trampled into the mud by the Stalinist degeneration. As the years of betrayal and deceit continue these principles become more and more blurred in the mind of the deluded workers who believe that their leaders are still adhering to Leninism.

If any one doubts that Trotsky's statement at the Dewey Commission represents the official Trotskyist line of today we refer him to the editorial statement of the Trotskyite paper, as

recently as August of this year:

"While such alliances are sometimes necessary and not wrong in themselves, they must always be recognized as unstable and subordinate instruments for aiding the workers' state." (The Militant, Editorial, August 28, 1943. My emphasis - D. S.)

One vivid manifestation of the Stalinist degeneration of the Comintern is the way the lickspittles of the Big Boss unhesitatingly accept the frauds handed down to them from above. When Stalin's Radek came out with the proposals of a military alliance, Cannon and Co. worked themselves up into a lather exposing the perversion of Lenin's principle, while Browder gave Radek's proposal prominent support. But when Trotsky himself openly abandoned the same principle, Cannon not only did not utter a syllable of criticism but actually accepted the new piece of Trotsky's opportunism as a gospel of Marxism.

D. Simms
October 1943

The Trotsky School

OF

Falsification PART I

COMPILED FROM ARTICLES WHICH APPEARED IN

THE BULLETIN

SEND FOR A FREE COPY

TO \

P. O. B. 67

STATION D

READ THE BULLETIN